Comparative Literature

Volume I SUMMER 1949 Number 3

CONTENTS

Lettres de Tourguéneff à Henry James. By Jean Seznec 193

Comprensione e fortuna di Shakespeare in Italia. By Piero Rebora 210

The Epic Style of the Pilgrim Aetheria. By Leo Spitzer 225

Phèdre et les poisons : Un thème de médiation tiré d'Euripide. By Marcel Chicoteau 259

The Pedigree of a *Soneto a lo divino*. By Joseph G. Fucilla 267

Book Reviews 272

Whitman Books and Articles (G. W. Allen). *Theory of Literature*, by René Wellek and Austin Warren (H.H.). *Bibliography of French Translations of English Works*, by Charles A. Rochedieu (E. G. Cox). *Perets*, trans. and ed. by Sol Liptzin (Milton Hindus). *Jephthah and his Daughter*, by W. O. Sypherd (C. G. Loomis). *The "Tristan and Isolde" of Gottfried von Strassburg*, trans. by Edwin H. Zeydel (Richard Jente).

Books Received 287

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

AUSTIN WARREN
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, **Comparative Literature** provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, and with broad views of movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on broad topics and problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions or exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME I Summer 1949 NUMBER 3

LETTRES DE TOURGUÉNEFF À HENRY JAMES

JEAN SEZNEC

LES RAPPORTS entre Tourguéneff et Henry James sont bien connus;[1] toutefois les quinze lettres[2] que voici apportent sur ce point assez de précisions et de nuances pour justifier leur publication.

Elles s'échelonnent sur huit années, du 7 août 1874 au 12 novembre 1882; et elles s'inscrivent entre deux portraits de Tourguéneff par James: le premier paru dans la *North American Review* d'avril 1874, et qui fut précisément à l'origine de leur relations, le second écrit après la mort du maître russe, et publié dans l'*Atlantic Monthly* en janvier 1884.[3]

James avait "découvert" Tourguéneff en 1873: dans son essai de l'année suivante, il est tout prêt à le proclamer "le premier romancier de son temps": égal aux Français par sa perfection formelle, il leur est supérieur par la richesse morale de ses sujets et par un détachement

[1] On trouvera une excellente esquisse dans A. Yarmolinsky, *Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age* (1926), pp. 333-335; des détails dans C. P. Kelley, "The Early Development of Henry James," *Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, XVI (1930), 63-65, 71, 85; et dans R. A. Gettmann, "Turgenev in England and America," *ibid.*, XVII (1941), 2. Dans *Henry James, The Major Phase* (1944), F. O. Matthiessen a marqué la dette de James envers T., particulièrement pp. 138 et 181.

[2] Les originaux de ces lettres se trouvent parmi les "James Papers" à la Houghton Library, à Harvard, ainsi que la lettre de James à W. D. Howells, du 3 février 1876, citée dans cet article. Nous remercions la Bibliothèque de Harvard d'en avoir autorisé la publication.

[3] Le premier a été recueilli dans *French Poets and Novelists* (1878), pp. 269-320; le second dans *Partial Portraits* (1888), pp. 291-323.

vis-à-vis de ses personnages qui n'implique chez lui ni cynisme, ni froideur. James se plaît à imaginer, à travers ses livres, la personnalité et même la physionomie de cet écrivain qu'il admire: la première lettre de Tourguéneff rectifie, comme on le verra, ce portrait imaginaire.

Mais James pourra bientôt le rectifier par lui-même; en 1875, il est à Paris, et le 22 novembre a lieu la première rencontre. Miss Kelley[4] prétend même que la principale raison de ce voyage en France était le désir de James de voir et d'entendre son héros. En tout cas, il ne fut pas déçu. Une lettre partiellement inédite à W. D. Howells, qu'on lira plus loin, donne la mesure de son enthousiasme. Alors commencent ces relations suivies pour lesquelles les lettres nous fournissent d'excellents points de repère; dans l'article nécrologique de 1884 "written under the impression of contact and intercourse," James les a d'ailleurs utilisées pour évoquer ses souvenirs. L'article forme donc ici le commentaire naturel des lettres; j'y ai puisé pour éclaircir, ou pour développer, mainte allusion.

Où se rencontrent les deux hommes? Rue Murillo, chez Flaubert, le dimanche, dans le cercle des réalistes où l'on parle "technique"; "en famille," chez les Viardot, où le bon Tourguéneff fait le pitre, et parfois le factotum; tantôt c'est à la rue de Douai, tantôt à Bougival, au Chalet des Frênes. Quelquefois aussi, après des rendez-vous éternellement différés, on déjeune à loisir—en tête à tête, ou en tout petit comité—dans un restaurant du boulevard; et l'après-midi se prolonge, tandis que Tourguéneff disserte sur l'art de la nouvelle—ou qu'il explique la Russie. On se voit dans le monde, car James fréquente chez la princesse Ouroussoff. Enfin lorsque James est en Angleterre et que Tourguéneff y va chasser la perdrix, ou recevoir un doctorat *honoris causa* à Oxford, les deux amis se ménagent un entretien à Londres, "le temps de causer."

James s'est attaché à purifier cette amitié de tout soupçon de vanité littéraire. A l'en croire,[5] son article de 1874 ne serait pour rien dans l'accueil affable qu'il reçut de Tourguéneff, et sa propre sympathie envers lui serait, elle aussi, toute désintéressée—car Tourguéneff faisait peu de cas des romans de son jeune confrère, si même il prenait la peine de les lire. C'est pousser la modestie jusqu'à l'affectation. A la vérité, les commentaires de Tourguéneff sur les livres de son ami ne dépassent guère le ton de la courtoisie; mais il reconnaît le talent; il note çà et là des qualités, et même des progrès; d'autre part, il est certain qu'il estimait le goût de James et son jugement; dès le premier jour il s'est montré "fort attentif" à sa critique.

Leur attitude respective vis-à-vis des réalistes français est curieuse à observer. C'est Tourguéneff qui a introduit James dans ce milieu; par

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 196, 221.
[5] *Partial Portraits*, pp. 297-298.

là, il lui a fourni l'occasion d'une expérience littéraire décisive. On sait que James, d'abord fasciné par le brillant de ces conversations où s'affrontaient Flaubert, Edmond de Goncourt, Zola, Daudet, Maupassant, avait été tenté de se fixer à Paris. Or, au bout de quelques mois[6] il quittait la France pour l'Angleterre, bien résolu à ne pas se parisianiser et à se soumettre, au contraire, "to the process of Londonizing." Miss Kelley, fidèle à son système,[7] interprète ainsi ce départ: James était venu à Paris pour rencontrer Tourguéneff; il l'avait vu, il avait appris sa leçon; en outre, il s'était aperçu que Tourguéneff s'absentait souvent de Paris, et pour de longues périodes; dès lors, il n'avait plus de raison de rester. En fait, le revirement de James s'explique surtout par sa désillusion. Il avait espéré trouver son "climat" en France, et les Français l'avaient désappointé.[8] D'abord, il les juge "peu accueillants"—grief singulier, si l'on considère qu'il avait été admis de plain-pied dans cette coterie très fermée;[9] de plus ils se révèlent "provinciaux," entichés d'eux-mêmes et de leurs productions, ignorants de tout le reste, et particulièrement des œuvres d'Henry James;[10] ils sont durs, étriqués, sans mystère; probes, il est vrai, mais d'une probité d'artisans indifférents à la morale; et pour tout dire, d'une scandaleuse, d'une insolente, d'une intolérable malpropreté.[11] Combien Tourguéneff, décidément, leur est supérieur! Non seulement il les dépasse par tout ce que l'on sent derrière lui de vaste et d'indéterminé; mais il les domine de toute son humanité généreuse, et de toute sa délicatesse.

Mais voilà: ces mêmes Français, Tourguéneff les admire, et James ne comprend plus: "He swallows them down in a manner that excites my extreme wonder."[12] C'est que Tourguéneff, lui, ne pense pas qu'un roman doive prêcher la vertu, et qu'il se garde de confondre "le malpropre" et "l'immoral": il essaie d'expliquer à James la différence dans une lettre de 1877 où il commente à son intention l'*Assommoir* (en

[6] Il écrit d'Etretat, dès l'été de 1876, qu'il en a fini avec Paris; il y revient pourtant, mais il n'y achève pas l'hiver.

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 228.

[8] Sur "l'épisode français," voir H. D. Davray, "Un Déraciné anglo-américain: Henry James d'après sa correspondance," *Mercure de France*, 15 février 1921; Van Wyck Brooks, *The Pilgrimage of Henry James* (1925), chap. III; M. R. Garnier, *Henry James et la France* (1927), particulièrement pp. 143-145; Morris Roberts, *Henry James' Criticism* (1929), pp. 38-42.

[9] E. Gosse, "Henry James," *London Mercury*, April 1920, p. 677, a très bien montré l'injustice de ce reproche.

[10] Percy Lubbock, *The Letters of Henry James*, I, 49. Gosse, *loc. cit.*, répond pertinemment: lu ou non par les réalistes français, James est reçu par eux amicalement *et en confrère*. Il est vrai qu'il n'est jamais question de James dans leur correspondance ni dans leurs œuvres. Le "petit jeune homme inconnu," rencontré par Edmond de Goncourt chez Hugo le 5 mars 1876 (voir *Journal*) n'est évidemment pas Henry James, comme Miss Kelley l'a un moment supposé, mais les parties encore inédites du *Journal* pourraient bien apporter ici quelque révélation.

[11] Morris Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42.

[12] *The Letters of Henry James*, I, 49.

même temps qu'*Hérodias* et la seconde *Légende des siècles*)—mais c'est peine perdue. James est "trop anglo-saxon, jusqu'aux moëlles, pour n'en avoir pas la morale aussi ferme qu'étroite."[13] Aussi bien, à cette date, il a définitivement opté pour la chaste Angleterre.

Tourguéneff regrette cette décision; mais il n'essaye pas de la combattre. Lui non plus ne s'était pas "gallicisé,"[14] et il avait trop bien pénétré le tempérament de James pour penser qu'il pourrait "s'adapter" ailleurs qu'à Londres.[15] Les lettres, ici, soulignent entre les deux hommes des affinités psychologiques. Gentleman raffiné, James aimait chez Tourguéneff "un grand seigneur tranquille, dont les opinions démocratiques n'effaçaient pas les grâces naturelles"; Tourguéneff, de son côté, avait très vite perçu, sous la distinction et la réserve puritaines de James, un fond de désenchantement qui leur était commun, et qui chez lui s'exprime en formules blasées; Tourguéneff est un vieillard, il est vrai, et James est jeune encore; mais "la vie personnelle égoïste, *la seule vivante*," s'est éteinte chez lui prématurément. Tourguéneff, sans en connaître la cause, devine cette tragédie intime, et il ajoute: "Cela arrive aux jeunes aussi bien qu'aux vieux." C'est comme s'il supprimait par là toute différence d'âge. Il ne reste en présence que deux cœurs mélancoliques et de fabrique fine—en marge de la vie, tous les deux.

De là le ton des lettres. Ce n'est pas, de la part de Tourguéneff, cette affection fraternelle, joviale et parfois truculente, qu'il témoigne à Flaubert.[16] Il ne se permet guère de facéties avec James—à peine s'il risque une plaisanterie sur "la Reine Victoria, lisant l'*Assommoir*." Mais ce sérieux ne va pas sans un certain abandon; il se plaint discrètement de sa santé à son jeune ami; il lui laisse entrevoir ses soucis privés; il l'entretient de ses craintes et de ses espérances pour sa patrie; et même il lui ouvre son cœur, à l'accasion de la guerre russo-turque et de l'hostilité anglaise: il se livre alors au point de révéler que le cosmopolite Tourguéneff est resté slave, et même pan-slave.

Le dernier billet est émouvant dans sa brièveté; il précède la dernière entrevue, en novembre 1882. James en a fait le récit; de Bougival, où il était allé rendre visite à Tourguéneff, ils rentrèrent à Paris ensemble —et les deux exilés se séparèrent pour toujours, au coin d'un boulevard.[17]

---

[13] Ces mots de T. dans la lettre en question (28 février 1877) s'appliquent à Ralston; mais, indirectement, ils visent James lui-même.

[14] James ne manque pas d'insister sur ce point dans *Partial Portraits*, p. 322.

[15] Lettre du 28 février 1877. Sur les sentiments de T. à l'égard de la vie anglaise, voir Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 279-280.

[16] Halpérine Kamisky, *Ivan Tourguéneff d'après sa correspondance avec ses amis français* (1901); Gustave Flaubert, *Lettres inédites à Tourguéneff*, présentation et notes de Gérard Gailly (1946).

[17] *Partial Portraits*, pp. 321-322.

Quelques années plus tard James, de retour à Paris, déjeunait avec Taine;[18] ils parlèrent de Tourguéneff, pour qui Taine professait une très haute admiration. "Cette conversation," note James, "m'a fait un bien immense; elle a ranimé, rafraichi, consacré pour ainsi dire, le rêve et le vœu qui de plus en plus m'ont occupé l'esprit ces derniers temps: que mon héritage littéraire se compose d'un grand nombre d'œuvres brèves—contes et nouvelles—illustrant toutes sortes d'aspects de la vie, dans tout ce qu'elle renferme de profond, et de délicat."

Jadis, dans une page prophétique, James avait annoncé aux Américains que s'il leur naissait un jour un grand romancier, il ressemblerait à Tourguéneff: il serait, comme lui, un dépaysé.[19] Il est devenu ce romancier; mais il n'offre pas seulement avec son modèle russe une certaine conformité d'attitude et de destinée; il a reçu de lui des préceptes de métier, et mieux encore, il a trouvé en lui un idéal d'homme et d'artiste qui répondait à ses exigences, et qui l'a aidé à définir le sien.[20]

CARLSBAD
(BOHEMIA)
KÖNIG VON ENGLAND
August 7th 1874

MY DEAR SIR:

I ought to have written you long ago—but I have some excuses of my silence. The letter you wrote to me never reached me. I was in Russia at the time—I know that it was sent to me from Paris, but it did not come to my hands. I received the April nº of the North American Review with your article on my writings[21] only in July; and the very day of its arrival I had a violent attack of gout, which has not disappeared even now—so that I had the greatest difficulty of reaching this place, where I hope to get rid of my ailings. But I am not willing to put further off the expression of my thanks.

I have read your article very attentively. It is rather difficult for an author to judge fairly a critical analysis of his own works[22]—I must confess that I, for

[18] *The Notebooks of Henry James*, edited by F. O. Matthiessen and K. B. Murdock (1947), p. 101 (15 mai 1889).

[19] *French Poets and Novelists*, p. 80; cf F. O. Matthiessen, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[20] Sur l'ambition de James d'être le Tourguéneff américain, voir encore la lettre à Stevenson citée par Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 335, et George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man*, Modern Library edition, p. 163.

[21] "Ivan Turguéneff," *North American Review*, CXVIII (Apr. 1874), pp. 326 sq., article recueilli dans *French Poets and Novelists* (1878).

[22] Pour les réactions de Tourguéneff à la critique, cf. *Partial Portraits* (1888), pp. 297-298: "It had never been his habit or his hope to bask in the light of criticism. Supremely modest as he was, he attached no great weight to what might happen to be said about him; for he felt that he was destined to encounter a very small amount of intelligent appreciation, especially in foreign countries. He gave me the impression of thinking of criticism as most serious workers think of it—that it is the amusement, the exercise, the subsistence of the critic . . . but that though it may often concern other readers, it does not much concern the artist himself."

instance, find always the praise too great and the blame too weak. I do not attribute this impression to diffidence or modesty: it is perhaps one of the many disguises which self-love enjoys in. All that I can say—is, that your article strikes me as being inspired by a fine sense of what is just and true; there is manliness in it and psychological sagacity and a clear litterary [*sic*] taste. I have only to observe, that the pessimism you reproach me—is perhaps—is certainly—an involuntary one.—My "excess of irony," as you call it—does not give me any pleasure—not even the bitter one, of which some people speak.[23]

I have a great sympathy for all that is American—and a great desire to see your country. But I ought to have indulged it earlier in life.—I am falling in the "sere, the yellow leaf"[24]—and that's not the best time for travelling. Still I do not altogether abandon the idea. It would please me very much indeed to make your acquaintance as well as that of some of your compatriots. In the mean time, believe me, my dear Sir

Yours most sincerely
IVAN TURGENIEW

P. S. My permanent adress [*sic*] is: Paris, Rue de Douai, 50
Mr. Henry James, Jr.

P/S. Truth compels me to say (v. page 349)—that I have large hands and feet, an ugly nose—and nothing of an "aristocratic" temperament[25]—and I do not regret it.

[PARIS]
50, RUE DE DOUAI
Nov. 20th [1875]
Saturday

MY DEAR SIR:

I will be happy indeed to make your acquaintance[26] and shall expect you Mon-

---

[23] Voici les expressions de l'article: "impossible to pronounce Mr. Turgénieff anything better than a pessimist," pp. 353-354; et encore: "we shall have to reproach Mr. T. with delighting in sadness—a tendency to abuse of irony." Toutefois, James accepte ce qu'il appelle: "spontaneous melancholy" et il reconnaît (*Partial Portraits*, p. 294) que "the element of melancholy in T.'s nature was deep and constant"; mais il rêve d'un romancier qui serait entièrement purgé de sarcasme.

[24] *Macbeth*, V, 3:

I have liv'd long enough: my way of life
Is fall'n into the sear, the yellow leaf . . .

Cf. *Partial Portraits*, p. 299: "He knew Shakespeare thoroughly."

[25] ". . . An aristocratic temperament with a democratic intellect." James se corrige lui-même dans *Partial Portraits*, p. 296: "In the little article in which I had attempted to express my admiration for his works, I had been moved to say of him that he had the aristocratic temperament: a remark which in the light of further knowledge seemed to me singularly inane. He was not subject to any definition of that sort, and to say that he was democratic would be (though his political ideal was a democracy) to give an equally superficial account of him. He felt and understood the opposite sides of life."

Quant à l'aspect physique de T., James l'admire comme un colosse séduisant: "The combination of his deep, soft, lovable spirit . . . with his immense, fair Russian physique, was one of the most attractive things conceivable. Exceedingly tall, and broad and robust in proportion . . . his head was one of the finest, and though the lines of his features were irregular, there was a great deal of beauty in his face. It was eminently of the Russian type—almost everything in it was wide" (*Partial Portraits*, pp. 304-305.)

[26] *Partial Portraits*, p. 295: "I shall never forget the impression he made upon me at that first interview. I found him adorable; I could hardly believe that he

day between 11 and 1 at my house. I hope you will find time and place convenient and beg you to accept the expression of my best feelings.

Yours very truly
Iv. Tourguéneff

Henry James Esqre

50 Rue de Douai
Lundi 31 janv. 76

Cher Monsieur James,

(Je commence par vous demander la permission de vous écrire en français).[27] Vous devez me trouver bien peu poli de ne pas vous avoir remercié jusqu'à présent du cadeau que vous m'avez fait;—la raison en est étrange—mais parfaitement véridique: j'ai de nouveau oublié votre adresse—et je n'ai pas pu retrouver où je l'avais inscrite! Aussi me suis-je décidé à écrire aujourd'hui à l'aventure, avec l'espoir que si, malgré tout, ma lettre vous parvient, vous aurez la complaisance de me le faire savoir. Je continue à être souffrant et à ne pas sortir— ce n'est plus la goutte—c'est une bronchite que j'ai attrapée.—Nous avons commencé, Mme. Viardot et moi, à lire votre livre, et je suis heureux de vous dire tout le plaisir que cela nous a causé. La scène (avant le départ) entre Rowland, la mère de Roderick, Miss Garland et Striker—est faite de main de maitre.[28] Je ne doute pas que la

---

would prove—that any man could prove—on nearer acquaintance so delightful as that." Cf. *The Notebooks of Henry James*, edited by F. O. Matthiessen and K. B. Murdock (1947), p. 26: "Ivan Turgénieff, most delightful and lovable of men . . ."

[27] *Partial Portraits*, p. 299: "He had read a great deal of English, and knew the language remarkably well—too well, I used often to think, for he liked to speak it with those to whom it was native and, successful as the effort always was, it deprived him of the facility and raciness with which he expressed himself in French . . . I have said that he had no prejudices, but perhaps after all he had one. I think he imagined it to be impossible to a person of English speech to converse in French with complete correctness." Ainsi donc Tourguéneff écrit en français à James—et lui parle anglais.

[28] *Partial Portraits*, pp. 298-299: "It was not on account of any esteem which he accorded to my own productions (I used regularly to send them to him) that I found him so agreeable, for to the best of my knowledge he was unable to read them. As regards one of the first that I offered him he wrote me a little note to tell me that a distinguished friend, who was his constant companion, had read three or four chapters aloud to him the evening before and that one of them was written *de main de maitre*. This gave me great pleasure, but it was my first and last pleasure of the kind. I continued to send him my fictions, because they were the only things I had to give; but he never alluded to the rest of the work in question, which he evidently did not finish, and never gave any sign of having read its successors. [Voir plus loin la lettre du 16 mai 1877, où T. s'enquiert d'un roman en cours; les lettres du 10 août 1877 et du 30 mars 1878, où T. promet de lire, et promet son avis, et encore la lettre du 13 janvier 1880, où il déclare *avoir lu* le premier volume de *Confidence*.] Presently I quite ceased to expect this, and saw why it was (it interested me much) that my writings could not appeal to him. He cared, more than anything else, for the air of reality, and my reality was not to the purpose. I do not think that my stories struck him as quite meat for men. The manner was more apparent than the matter; they were too tarabiscoté. As I once heard him say of the style of a book—had on the surface too many little flowers and knots of ribbon." La lettre du 13 janvier 1880 confirme indirectement cette impression de James: T. l'y félicite sur sa manière *devenue plus ferme et plus large*. Dans la présente lettre, il s'agit, naturellement, de *Roderick Hudson*. Si Tourguéneff l'avait lu jusqu'au bout peut-être se serait-il aperçu que Roderick ressemble à son *Roudine*, comme plus tard *The American* devra quelque chose à

continuation de la lecture nous fasse le même plaisir—et je ne veux pas tarder davantage à vous envoyer mes meilleures félicitations.

Si cette lettre vous parvient, vous seriez bien aimable de pousser jusqu'à la Rue de Douai.—La dernière fois que vous êtes venu—je me sentais mal et me mettais au lit.—Je ne bougerai pas de chez moi tous ces jours-ci.

Mille amitiés—et au revoir

Iv. Tourguéneff

50 Rue de Douai
mercredi soir [1876 ?]

Cher Monsieur James,

Cela vous amuserait-il d'assister à un bal costumé où il y aura beaucoup de jolies figures?—Dans ce cas, voici une invitation de la part de Mr et Mme Viardot.—Si vous voulez pas faire la dépense d'un domino, il y aura dans le vestibule des toques et des tabliers de marmiton pour les messieurs en habit.[29]

Au revoir Dimanche, je l'espère—et mille amitiés

Ivan Tourguéneff

C'est ici le lieu, semble-t-il, de citer un extrait d'une lettre inédite de James à William Dean Howells;[30] écrite le 3 février 1876, à un moment où il subit encore ce charme parisien qui va bientôt se dissiper. Elle a surtout l'intérêt d'exprimer cette sympathie enthousiaste—et durable—que Tourguéneff lui inspira dès leur première rencontre; nul doute que son correspondant ait lu ce passage avec un fervent intérêt.

On connaît le mot sarcastique de George Moore: "Henry James went to France and read Tourgueneff. W. D. Howells stayed at home and read Henry James."[31] En fait, Tourguéneff avait été une des "passions littéraires" de Howells, qui avait commencé d'en faire ses délices en 1871.[32] Il était avide de détails sur l'homme, et voici comment James satisfait sa curiosité:

Une Nichée de gentilshommes. Miss Kelley a bien démêlé ces ressemblances: analogie de caractères, parallélisme des situations, etc.; à son avis, dans ces premières œuvres, l'influence de T. est entrée dans sang de James "comme un sérum tonique." Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 176, 179. 188, 239.

[29] James ne goûtait guère ce genre de soirées. Il parle à son père *(The Letters of Henry James,* edited by P. Lubbock, I, 46) le 11 avril 1876 de ces dimanches "en famille" chez les Viardot, qu'il juge *rather dingy.* Il s'étonne et s'attendrit de voir la bonne grâce avec laquelle Tourguéneff y participe. "[It is] both strange and sweet to see poor Turgenev acting charades of the most extravagant descriptions, dressed out in old shawls and masks, going on all fours, etc. The good faith with which T., at his age and with his glories, can go into them is a striking example of that spontaneity which Europeans have and we have not. Fancy Longfellow, Lowell, or Charles Eliot Norton doing the like, and every Sunday evening!" Ce bal costumé, il est vrai, était une soirée un peu plus "officielle"; mais il est douteux que James, s'il y est allé, se soit laissé affubler en marmiton. Sur les divertissements chez les Viardot, voir Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

[30] Une autre lettre de James à W. D. Howells, datée du 28 mai, a été publiée par Lubbock, I, 47.

[31] *Confessions of a Young Man,* Modern Library edition, p. 163.

[32] Gettmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-57, qui cite *My Literary Passions,* p. 229.

"Yes, I see a good deal of Tourguéneff and am excellent friends with him. He has been very kind to me and has inspired me with an extreme regard. He is everything that one could desire—robust, sympathetic, modest, simple, intelligent, profound, naïf, in fine angelic.[33] He has also made me acquainted with G. Flaubert, to whom I have likewise taken a great fancy, and at whose house I have seen the little *coterie* of the young realists in fiction. They are all charming talkers,—though as editor of the austere *Atlantic* it would startle you to hear some of their projected subjects . . . "

Le temps n'est plus très loin où James sera repris par ces mêmes scrupules d'austérité dont il lui plairait assez qu'on pût le croire affranchi. Il affecte un instant la désinvolture d'un boulevardier pour scandaliser le provincial Howells. Mais la France ne saurait le retenir longtemps. C'est à Londres qu'est adressée la lettre suivante de Tourguéneff.

50 Rue de Douai
mercredi soir
28 fév. 1877

Mon cher Monsieur James,

J'ai reçu votre lettre qui m'a fait le plus grand plaisir.—(Permettez-moi de vous écrire en français—cela vous est indifférent et pour moi c'est plus facile). Ralston a dû vous dire que je me suis enquis de votre adresse[34]—je voulais vous écrire—il y avait trop longtemps que nos rapports restaient interrompus.—Vous nous avez bien manqué ici;—cependant il ne faut pas trop se plaindre—puisque après tout vous êtes content de votre séjour à Londres—et que vous y travaillez. Une fois que la vie personelle [*sic*] égoïste (la seule vivante)—est finie—(et c'est un peu, je crois, votre cas—car cela arrive aux jeunes aussi bien qu'aux vieux)[35] ce n'est plus qu'une question d'*adaptation;*—si l'on s'arrange tolérablement dans son milieu —c'est tout ce qu'on peut demander.—Cependant nous serions tous bien contents, si vous vouliez revenir vous *adapter* à Paris.

J'ai transmis vos amitiés à la Psse Ouroussoff et à Joukofski.[36]—Celui-ci a été absent pendant près de trois mois—et n'est à Paris que depuis quelques jours—toujours dans la même attitude élégante, un peu mélancolique et sceptique d'un jeune homme de talent—qui se tient sur le seuil de l'avenir—sans y entrer.—Samedi je dois dîner chez les Tourguéneff. (C'est le jour commémoratif de l'émancipation de paysans en Russie—et on y fête le souvenir du bon et vénérable

[33] Cf. *Partial Portraits*, pp. 293-294.

[34] Sur les rapports de Tourguéneff avec son traducteur, le critique anglais Ralston, voir Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 332-333. Tourguéneff avait écrit le 18 février. Cf. "Lettres inédites de Tourguéneff à Ralston," traduites par J. W. Bienstock, *Revue Mondiale*, 1er janvier 1925.

[35] Le 22 janvier, donc à peine plus d'un mois avant, T. écrivait à Ralston *(loc. cit.)* : "Essayez de vous lier avec Henry James; c'est un homme très aimable qui a beaucoup de talent *avec un certain penchant à la tristresse* et qui, sans doute, ne vous effraiera pas."

[36] Voir *The Notebooks of Henry James*, pp. 25, 26: "In the spring [of 1876] at Madame Turgenieff's I made the acquaintance of Paul Joukowsky. *Non ragioniam di lui—ma guarda e passa*"; p. 29 "[In 1869] : I spent three days with Paul Joukowsky at Posilipo."

Nicolas Tourguéneff, dont cette émancipation a été le " leading thought.")[37] Je leur dirai alors ce que vous m'avez appris à propos d'eux.

Je vous ai envoyé hier le "Fils de Pope."[38] C'est ce qu'on appelle " a ghastly story"—et ce n'est pas grand'chose en somme.—Cela m'a été raconté. Dès que mon roman[39] aura été terminé dans le "Temps" (26 feuilletons ont déjà paru—et il y en aura en tout une cinquantaine—) je vous l'enverrai bien certainement. Il n'a pas eu grand succès en Russie—on a même prononcé le mot de fiasco.—Je ne suis plus au diapason de la critique, pourtant je ne crois pas que ce soit une mauvaise chose.—Mais la fortune n'aime pas les vieillards—même en littérature. Peut-etre que plus tard une opinion plus favorable se formera.—Je me donne la petite consolation de le croire.

Ralston est trop anglais jusqu'à la moëlle des os—pour n'en pas avoir la morale —aussi ferme—qu'étroite. Et pourtant, la main sur la conscience—je ne puis accuser mes ouvrages d'immoralité.[40]

L' "Assommoir" n'est pas non plus une œuvre immorale—mais diablement sale.[41]—Malgré tout le talent que Zola y déploie—ce livre ne pourra avoir aucun succès, hors de France.—Si j'étais un caricaturiste du Punch—je me serais amusé à représenter "la Reine Victoria, lisant l'Assommoir."

J'ai salué Flaubert de votre part. Il va bien—ses "blue devils" l'ont quitté. Il vient d'achever une troisème légende—sur Hérodiade—qui est bien belle.[42] Son livre paraîtra au mois de Mai.

Avez-vous vu la "Légende des Siècles" de V. Hugo—la continuation—qui

---

[37] L' "oncle Nicolas" avait aidé T. à préparer l'émancipation de ses serfs en 1858; plus tard il avait eu des difficultés avec son neveu qui en 1867 dut lui retirer l'administration de ses domaines; mais T. lui avait gardé son affection. Cf. Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 173, 256.

[38] C'est le conte traduit en anglais sous le titre, *Father Alexey's Story*, et daté: Paris, 1877.

[39] Il s'agit de *Terres Vierges (Virgin Soil)*. Voir la lettre du 22 janvier à Ralston, citée plus haut, note 35: "*Le Temps* commencera demain la publication de *Terres Vierges . . .*"

[40] Sans doute T. fait-il allusion à quelque propos de Ralston, rapporté par James. En tout cas, par-delà Ralston, sa réflexion vise James lui-même, qui s'est donné (dans *French Poets and Novelists*) comme un champion de la "moralité" anglo-saxonne. Cf. Morris Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-38. Dans *Partial Portraits*, pp. 296-297, James reconnait que T. avait une notion différente de la moralité d'une œuvre d'art: "Our Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, moralistic, conventional standards were far away from him." Quant à T. lui-même, il déclarait à H. Holt: "I am no Puritan" (cité par Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 333). Dans les moments privilégiés où son sens artistique prend le dessus sur sa pruderie, James a reconnu qu'un "réaliste" comme Flaubert peut être le plus sévère des moralistes: "Every out-and-out realist who provokes serious meditation may claim that he is a moralist" (*French Poets and Novelists*, p. 256). C'est bien le point de vue de T. Seulement T. ne réclamait pas ces libertés choquantes, si chères à ses confrères français (*Partial Portraits*, p. 303).

[41] *Partial Portraits*, pp. 302-303 (à propos de l'*Assommoir*, suspendu en feuilleton): "T., who understood everything, understood Zola too, and rendered perfect justice to the high solidity of much of his work." Mais lui, James, avait écrit, et même avant l'*Assommoir*: "The real for him (Zola) means exclusively the unclean, and he utters his crudities with an air of bravado, which makes them doubly untolerable" (Lettre du 22 avril 1876, publiée le 13 mai dans le *New York Tribune*).

[42] Voir dans Gérard Gailly, *op. cit.*, la lettre de Flaubert à Tourguéneff du 24 janvier (p. 131): "J'aurai fini *Hérodias* avant le 15 du mois prochain—peut-être même dans huit jours."

vient de paraître?[43] Il y a de très belles choses—mais aussi bien du remplissage—et cette trompette de cuivre, qui vous sonne dans les oreilles sans discontinuer un instant—finit par être horriblement fatigante.—Mais personne n'a *rencontré* des vers plus magnifiques que lui—c'est un Trouveur.

Quand se reverra-t-on? Je pars dans un mois pour la Russie et je reviens ici en juin.

Je vous serre cordialement la main et suis

votre dévoué

Iv. Tourguéneff

50 Rue de Douai
Mercredi, 16 mai 77.

Mon cher ami—(vous continuez à me permettre de vous écrire en français?) j'ai reçu le no de "The Nation"—où il y a votre article sur mon roman[44]—et je vous en remercie.—Tout en aimant ce livre moins que les autres—vous êtes très bienveillant pour lui.Quelque chose a manqué à ce dernier ouvrage qu'un esprit d'une perception aussi fine que le vôtre a dû bientôt découvrir: la pleine liberté.—J'ai écrit tout le temps sous un nuage, en me demandant si ce que je faisais avait la chance de passer: Il *fallait* que mon roman parût en Russie—et cela n'a pas été sans peine et sans résultat fâcheux pour l'œuvre elle-même.—Enfin la chose est faite—je crois qu'elle a été utile—et la voilà maintenant dans le tourbillon—et il n'y a plus à y revenir. D'autres plus heureux et plus jeunes feront mieux.

A l'heure qu'il est je devrais me trouver à Pétersbourg; un fâcheux contretemps m'a retenu à Paris.—J'ai eu—il y a de cela huit jours—une violente attaque de goutte dans les *deux* pieds, qui m'a retenu pendant 6 jours dans mon lit et qui m'empêche encore de sortir. Cependant—comme je vais mieux, j'espère bien partir dans une semaine d'ici.—Je serai de retour à la fin de juillet s'il ne m'arrive rien d'extraordinaire—et j'irai m'établir à Bougival, aux Frênes, 16, Rue de Mesmes.[45]—Aurai-je la chance de vous y voir? Aurez vous achevé votre roman[46] a cette époque?

J'ai vu Joukofsky il n'y a pas longtemps: il pense aller à Londres. Quant à la princesse O.—il y a bientôt un mois que je ne l'ai vue—je m'en fais un grand reproche—d'autant plus grand que je la sais souffrante. Mais vous connaissez l'affreuse habitude qu'a la vie de fuir comme l'eau à travers un tamis. Cependant je ne quitterai pas Paris sans lui avoir fait une visite.

Les temps sont sombres—et je ne crois pas qu'ils s'éclaircissent de sitôt.[47] Il faut avoir *beaucoup* de patience maintenant—rien que pour vivre.

Adieu—au revoir—Je vous serre cordialement la main et suis

votre bien dévoué

Iv. Tourguéneff

---

[43] La seconde *Légende des siècles* porte la date du 26 février.

[44] C'est le numéro du 26 avril, qui contient le compte-rendu de *Virgin Soil* (p. 252). James ignore l'aspect documentaire de l'œuvre—essentiel pour T., comme on le voit ici,—et ne s'intéresse qu'à l'étude morale. Voir Gettmann, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Comparer la lettre de Flaubert à T. sur le même roman, le 10 mai (Gérard-Gailly, p. 136).

[45] Il avait acheté la propriété en 1874 avec les Viardot; il s'y installa au printemps de 1876, y revint les étés suivants. Cf. Yarmolinsky, *op cit.*, pp. 289-290.

[46] Sans doute *The American*.

[47] Allusion à la guerre russo-turque dont les répercussions font craindre à T., comme on le verra dans les lettres suivantes, un conflit russo-britannique. A la suite des massacres des paysans d'Herzégovine par les Turcs, la Russie avait pris une attitude agressive vis à vis de la Porte; elle mobilisa en novembre 1876.

BOUGIVAL
(SEINE ET OISE)
16 RUE DE MESMES
vendredi, 10 août 1877

MON CHER AMI,

J'ai eu grand plaisir à recevoir votre lettre et votre livre[48]—et je vous remercie beaucoup d'avoir pensé à moi. Je me mettrai à vous lire aujourd'hui et je vous dirai mon avis sincèrement comme il convient de le faire aux gens d'un talent pareil au vôtre—Comme vous le supposiez, je suis en effet revenu de Russie il y a plus de trois semaines,—et me voilà à Bougival jusqu'à l'hiver.—Je compte bien vous y voir, puisque vous me dites que vous quittez l'Angleterre sous peu—Je vous remercie de la sympathie que vous nous témoignez—à nous autres russes,—vous devez en trouver fort peu autour de vous[49]—et elle m'est d'autant plus précieuse.

Vous pensez aisément que je me sens triste et préoccupé; des circonstances particulières et personelles[50] [*sic*] me rendent la vie un peu pénible à l'heure qu'il est—en y ajoutant leur amertume.—Enfin "tout casse, tout passe, tout lasse"—comme on dit; et c'est, malgré tout, une consolation. Pendant mon séjour en Russie j'ai vu, en effet toute sorte de bonnes et de mauvaises choses;—j'ai rapporté beaucoup d'impressions—mais je n'ai—jusqu'à présent, aucun désir de les formuler ou de les fixer, je suis si loin de toute activité littéraire, que je me demande parfois, si j'en ai jamais déployé—et si c'est bien moi, qui ai écrit ces livres, qui ont un commencement, un milieu, une fin?—Enfin—tout cela s'arrangera— se *tassera*—mais pour le moment je marche dans le brouillard.[51] J'ai vu hier soir la famille

---

[48] Sans doute *The American*.

[49] Dès octobre 1876, la presse anglaise s'était déchaînée contre la Russie; la mobilisation russe porta l'excitation à son comble. En juillet 1877, le gouvernement anglais publie un livre bleu sur les atrocités *russes*. Après la prise de Kars en décembre et la marche sur Constantinople, Disraëli enverra la flotte dans les Détroits et on manifestera contre la Russie dans les théâtres de Londres. Tennyson et Swinburne se mettent de la partie. Mais les écrivains russes s'y étaient mis aussi, à commencer par Tourguéneff qui dès l'automme de 1876 avait ridiculisé la politique anglaise dans *Croquet à Windsor* (traduit en France par deux on trois journaux, et aux Etas-Unis par *The Nation*, le 5 octobre, p. 213). Il semble que T. ait envoyé ce "morceau de poésie" à Flaubert qui le trouve "chouette" (Gérard Gailly, lettre du 4 février 1877, p. 128).

Flaubert, d'ailleurs, témoigne lui aussi de la sympathie à son ami qu'il voit très affecté par les événements. Dès le 14 décembre 1876 (G.G., p. 124) il souhaite l'entier anéantissement de la Turquie; en juillet 1877 (p. 143) il "souhaite aux enfants du prophète une violente râclée"; et le 17 septembre (p. 146) il ajoute en post-scriptum: "Parlez-moi de la Russie. Cette horrible guerre ne finira donc pas!"

Sur les sentiments véritables de James nous sommes renseignés par une lettre à Grace Norton du 7 août 1877 (Lubbock, I, 55-56). Il blâme "l'attitude brutalement pro-turque d'une immense masse d'Anglais"; et il ajoute: "I am no fanatic of Russia, but I think the Emperor of Russia might have been treated as a gentleman."

[50] Il s'agit de ses difficultés financières, causées par des déprédations de son intendant (chassé en juin 1876) et la dévaluation du rouble, conséquence de la guerre; de ses démêlés avec son gendre Bruère qui fait banqueroute, boit, et menace sa femme, laquelle avec ses deux enfants reste finalement à la charge de son père. Cf. Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-292.

[51] Cf. l'expression du Journal de T., le 17 mars 1877: "Des ténèbres plus noires que la nuit envahissent mon esprit. Je n'ai ni le droit ni le désir de vivre: plus rien à faire, à attendre, ou à espérer"—cité par Yarmolinsky, p. 293.

Tourguéneff (ce sont nos voisins, comme vous le savez peut-être)—et je leur ai tranmis vos amitiés—ainsi qu'a la famille Viardot; tout le monde va bien.—Joukofsky est quelque part en Italie; les autres se sont disséminés.

Ainsi—c'est entendu—au revoir et bientôt—je vous souhaite toutes les meilleures chances du monde et vous serre cordialement la main.

T. à v.

Iv. Tourguéneff

Bougival
Les Frênes
Châlet
Sunday. Septber 16th 77

My dear Mr. James,

I am very glad to hear that you are in Paris and very desirous to see you.—Will you come, *Tuesday* at twelve o'clock—let us say at Bignou's[52]—at the corner of the Boulevard and the Chaussée d'Antin—we'll breakfast together.[53] In my present state of mind I rather avoid to see human faces—but you are naturally an exception.—Later in the week, I hope, you will come and visit me at Bougival.—We'll arrange that on Tuesday.

Au revoir—and believe me

Yours very truly
Iv. Tourguéneff

50 Rue de Douai
Samedi, 30 mars 78

Mon cher ami—(vous me permettez, n'est-ce pas? de vous écrire en français)—il y a longtemps que j'aurais dû répondre à votre aimable et longue lettre—(qui a été bientôt suivie de l'envoi de votre livre)[54]—mais toutes sortes d'affaires et de préoccupations m'en ont empêché—et je vous fais mes excuses. (Je vous remercie en même temps pour votre livre, que je me promets de lire à tête reposée).

Votre lettre était pleine de bonnes et cordiales paroles[55] à propos de la paix qui venait d'être conclue entre mon pays et la Turquie;[56] elles m'ont fait du bien, en me prouvant une fois de plus votre sympathie;—mais je n'ai pas eu un moment

---

[52] Le guide Joanne de 1876 *(Paris Diamant)* signale le café Bignou, 38 Boulevard des Italiens, au coin de la Chaussée d'Antin, comme "un de ces restaurants où l'on ne doit entrer qu'avec l'intention de dîner sérieusement" (p. xxxiv).

[53] Cf. *Partial Portraits*, pp. 311-312: "In Paris . . . he was always open to proposals for the midday breakfast. He was very fond of that wonderful Parisian déjeuner. It was not, at any rate, when one had the good fortune to breakfast at twelve o'clock with T. that one was struck with its being an inconvenient hour. There are places in Paris which I can think of only in relation to some occasion on which he was present, and when I pass them the particular things I heard him say come back to me. There is a café in the Avenue de l'Opera—on the right as you leave the Boulevard—where I once had a talk with him which was prolonged far into the afternoon." Ce n'est pas de cette occasion particulière qu'il s'agit dans la lettre, car James précise plus loin (p. 313) que c'était en décembre.

[54] Sans doute *French Poets and Novelists. Watch and Ward* et *The Europeans* parurent aussi cette année-là.

[55] Dans une lettre à Grace Norton du 15 décembre 1877 (Lubbock I, p. 58), James se réjouit de la prise de Plevna par les Russes (10 décembre): "England," commente-t-il, "is supposed to be dreadfully snubbed."

[56] Le traité de San-Stefano avait été signé le 3 mars.

d'illusion. Je pressentais l'inévitabilité de la guerre entre la Russie et l'Angleterre et tout ce qui se disait du Congrès,[57] des solutions diplomatiques—m'a trouvé absolument incrédule. Cette guerre se fera—elle était désignée [*sic*] longtemps d'avance—la question d'Orient ne pouvait pas finir autrement; elle sera longue et dure, cette guerre, j'espère qu'elle finira par l'expulsion des Turcs et la libération des nationalités slaves,[58] grecques et autres;[59] mais mon pays restera ruiné pour longtemps—et mes yeux ne verront même pas les réformes qu'on nous promettait à l'intérieur.[60]—Vous comprendrez aisément qu'avec des convictions pareilles je vois l'avenir en noir—et vous me permettrez de ne plus m'appesantir sur ce sujet.—

Je suis resté à Paris plus longtemps que je n'en avais eu l'intention; mon voyage en Russie est remis à la fin du mois de Mai, après l'ouverture du Salon et de l'Exposition Universelle.—Vous verra-t-on d'ici là?

Je suis très heureux d'apprendre que vous êtes en bonne santé et que vous travaillez.—Je ne puis pas me plaindre non plus de ma santé,—quant au travail—"Adieu, paniers: vendanges sont faites."

Je vois assez rarement la Psse Ourousoff et Joukofski; cependant je sais qu'ils vont bien.—

Notre ami commun, Ralston, a été très gravement malade ici,—il a fini par pouvoir retourner en Angleterre—et j'espère qu'il va se rétablir définitivement dans l'air natal.

Je vous serre bien cordialement la main et me dis

votre très dévoué
Iv. Tourguéneff

Paris
50 Rue de Douai
Wednesday, June 11th, 79

My dear Mr. James

Ralston has not told you all: I go to Oxford because the University does me the unexpected honour of making me a D. C. L.—the promotion will take place on the 18th: in a week.[61]

---

[57] Le congrès de Berlin, convoqué à la demande de l'Angleterre et de l'Autriche, appuyées par l'Allemagne, se réunira le 13 juin.

[58] Cf. Hélène héroïne du roman *Nakanune* (*A la veille*): elle s'éprend d'un jeune patriote bulgare qui rêve de libérer son pays de la tyrannie turque. James avait remarqué cet épisode (*French Poets and Novelists*, pp. 287-288).

[59] Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 328, déclare: "T. had no feeling of racial solidarity with the other Slavs;" la lettre paraît contredire cette assertion. James, lui, avait bien vu à quel point T. était resté Russe, et que la guerre russo-turque avait renforcé ses sentiments patriotiques (*Partial Portraits*, pp. 304-308).

[60] Ces réformes étaient la hantise de T., et James l'a bien souligné: ses espérances et ses appréhensions à ce sujet tenaient dans son existence une place plus importante que l'art de la nouvelle. "He wrote fictions and dramas, but the great drama of his life was the struggle for a better state of things in Russia" (*Partial Portraits*, p. 322).

[61] Sur les circonstances, voir Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 326 sq.; et Gettman, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89. T. avait déjà fait plusieurs visites en Angleterre, et il y avait rencontré Tennyson, Carlyle, George Eliot, et Rossetti; en 1878 un dîner avait été donné en son honneur, auquel assistaient plusieurs hommes de lettres britanniques. Les remous provoqués par la guerre russo-turque s'étaient apaisés. Pendant son

I leave Paris sunday evening: I come to London Monday—and leave it the same day for Oxford—or Tuesday very early.—I have the greatest desire of seeing you myself; but I still don't know to what hotel I shall go—but as soon as I'll come to London—Monday in the morning—I'll send you a telegramm [*sic*]. On my way back from Oxford I will stop only two days at London—and we could then have a quiet dinner on *Friday the 20th*. I am obliged to be in Paris Sunday the 22d.

"A bientôt" in every case and believe me

Yours very truly
Iv. Tourguéneff

Bougival
Les Frênes
Châlet
(Seine et Oise)
Jeudi 6 nov. 79

Mon cher Mr James,

(Vous savez que je prends la liberté de vous écrire en français) je me hâte de répondre à votre aimable lettre.—Si je n'ai pas donné signe de vie tout ces temps-ci—ce n'est pas parceque j'ai été malade—(je ne compte pas une légère attaque de goutte)—mais c'est qu'il y a eu des maladies dans la maison—un accouchement assez laborieux de la seconde fille de Mme Viardot—un enfant de 5 ans ayant pris la scarlatine etc. . . . [62] Tout cela n'est pas encore fini—mais j'ai, de mon côté un si grand désir d'avoir un "quiet chat" avec vous—que je viendrai vous trouver *Lundi* à votre nouvelle demeure vers 1 heure—et nous irons déjeuner ensemble.—

Quant à la princesse Ourousoff elle est à Paris—Rue Washington (ci-devant Billault) no 18—Faites lui une visite—elle sera enchantée de vous voir.

En attendant, recevez un cordial shakehands

De votre tout dévoué
Iv. Tourguéneff

Bougival
Les Frênes
Châlet
(Seine et Oise)
Dimanche 9 nov. 79

Mon cher ami,

Je ne pourrai venir chez vous demain qu'à 1 h ½ au lieu de midi[63]—mais je suppose que cela vous est assez indifférent. À demain donc et mille amitiés

Iv. Tourguéneff

---

séjour à Oxford la même année, il fut l'hote de Max Müller, qui n'était pas encore très rassuré, cependant, de loger un Russe chez lui. Mais T. produisit la meilleure impression auprès de la Faculté—et le doctorat *honoris causa* lui fut offert au mois de juin suivant. Toutefois, toutes les rancunes n'étaient pas désarmées. En mai 1880, le *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, dans un article intitulé "Russia and Nihilism in the Novels of M. Turgenev," rappelait amèrement à ses lecteurs que ni Thackeray ni Dickens n'avaient jamais reçu la robe de Docteur d'Oxford.

[62] Voir dans Yarmolinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-288, combien étroitement T. était associé à la vie de la famille Viardot.

[63] Cf. *Partial Portraits*, pp. 310-311: "It was impossible to see much of him

50 Rue de Douai
Paris
Mardi 13 Janv. 80

Mon cher Mr James,

J'ai à vous faire des excuses soignées: il y a trois semaines que Mr Chatto et Windus m'ont envoyé votre roman[64]—et je ne vous en ai pas encore remercié! Il est vrai que je me suis rendu chez vous—mais vous étiez déjà parti pour Londres—d'où vous ne revenez, à ce qu'il paraît, que vers la fin du mois. Je crains bien que vous ne me trouviez plus ici—je pars pour la Russie—et je ne veux pas passer plus longtemps pour ingrat.—Je vous remercie donc pour vos deux volumes, dont j'ai déjà lu le premier, qui m'a beaucoup plu et intéressé.—Votre manière est devenue plus ferme et plus simple.—Je vous parlerai plus longuement de votre roman, quand je l'aurai lu en entier.

Je n'ai pas grand'chose à vous dire sur ma personne; ma santé a été passable—mais la vie n'a pas été bien gaie.—Du reste, elle l'est rarement à mon âge.

J'ai vu une ou deux fois la princesse Ouroussoff, nous avons parlé de vous.

Recevez mes meilleures amitiés et croyez moi

votre tout dévoué
Ivan Tourguéneff

Six Mile Bottom
Newmarket[65]
Jeudi, 20 oct. 81

Mon cher ami,

Je suis arrivé ici mardi et n'avais reçu votre lettre qu'à l'instant de mon départ. Comme j'ai moi-même le plus grand désir de vous voir—et que vous ne quittez Londres que le 28—je viendrai chez vous (Bolton Str.) après demain Samedi vers 4 heures—A mon regret, je ne pourrai diner avec vous ce jour-là, je suis invité—et je pars pour la France dès Dimanche matin—Mais nous aurons le temps de causer.

À bientôt et mille amitiés
Iv. Tourguéneff

---

without discovering that he was a man of delays. There was something Asiatic in his faculty of procrastination. He liked to breakfast *au cabaret*, and freely consented to an appointment. It is not unkind to add that, at first, he never kept it. After the appointment had been made . . . there arrived a note in which Ivan Serguéitch excused himself, and begged that the meeting might be deferred to another date. I remember no appointment that he exactly kept." Cette inexactitude faisait le désespoir et l'exaspération de Flaubert.

[64] Probablement la première édition anglaise de *Confidence* (Chatto et Windus, 2 vols). Voir Leroy Phillips, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James* (1906), p. 19.

[65] T. était allé chasser chez un ami. Voir *Partial Portraits*, p. 305: "Late in life he continued to shoot, and he had a friend in Cambridgeshire for the sake of whose partridges, which were famous, he used sometimes to cross the Channel."

(Seine et Oise)
Bougival
Les Frênes
Dimanche, ce 12 nov. 82

Mon cher ami,

Je reviens à Paris—probablement—Jeudi et vous en informerai immédiatement.—Je suis très content de vous savoir de retour.[66]

Mille amitiés
Iv. Tourguéneff

Harvard University

[66] Ce fut, très probablement, leur dernier rendez-vous. James en a rapporté les circonstances dans *Partial Portraits*, pp. 321-322: "The last time I saw him, in November 1882, it was at Bougival . . . He was to drive into Paris . . . and he gave me a seat in the carriage. For an hour and a half he talked, and never better. When we got into the city I alighted on the boulevard extérieur, as we were to go in different directions. I bade him goodbye at the carriage window, and never saw him again. There was a kind of fair going on, near by, in the chill November air, beneath the denuded little trees of the Boulevard, and a Punch and Judy show, from which nasal sounds proceeded . . ." C'est dans cette dernière entrevue que James remarqua, une fois de plus, la qualité de l'anglais de T. "His opportunities for speaking English were not at all so frequent, so that when the necessity (or at least the occasion) presented itself, he remembered the phrases he had encountered in books. This often gave a charming quaintness and an unexpected literary turn to what he said. 'In Russia, in spring, if you enter a beechen grove'—those words come back to me from the last time I saw him" *(Partial Portraits*, p. 299).

COMPRENSIONE E FORTUNA DI SHAKESPEARE IN ITALIA

PIERO REBORA

SEMBRA strano che fino ad un secolo fa gli uomini anche più sensibili non vedessero le opere d'arte come le vediamo noi; quando Ludovico Carracci, per citare un esempio, era considerato artista insuperato (e ancora Joshua Reynolds lo dichiara "the nearest to perfection"); quando un poeta come Shelley poteva scrivere che Michelangelo non possedeva "sense of moral dignity and loveliness"; quando tutti gli artisti primitivi erano ignorati o spregiati. Per secoli gli uomini più colti erano passati davanti al campanile di Giotto a Firenze senza neppure accorgersi dei meravigliosi esagoni in bassorilievo rappresentanti le varie arti, pur così limpidamente belli; e ci volle poi John Ruskin per fare aprire gli occhi su certi valori dell'arte preraffaellita. Pochi casi sono più sorprendenti di tale fluttuare di giudizi, di quello che si riferisce alla varia fortuna dell'opera di Shakespeare. Si tratta di quasi incredibili alti e bassi, che tutti più o meno conoscono, e che rivelano le profonde alterazioni del costume e della sensibilità estetica e morale, sotto l'influsso di mutevoli situazioni culturali e sociali.

Che molti scrittori, anche inglesi, potessero ritenere, nel settecento, *Hamlet* e *Macbeth* "farse mostruose"; o le più care commedie Shakespeariane "silly," ciò può certo stupire. Si trattava di opinioni vincolate da quasi incredibili pregiudizi, radicati in un accademismo formale, che rendeva meschini e pedanteschi anche gli ingegni migliori. Ma c'era però anche dell'altro: cioè l'azione di un effettivo gusto diverso, di un criterio estetico pregiudicato da un particolare dogmatismo sociale e morale; tanto che fra gli stessi inglesi, che pure dovevano intendere perfettamente la lingua (ma però non sempre il linguaggio) del loro poeta, molti potevano disprezzarlo, e considerare il *Cato* di Addison assai superiore al *Julius Caesar* e all'*Antony and Cleopatra*. Quel buongustaio di Samuel Pepys, che doveva rispecchiare un'opinione media, poteva affermare che *Twelfth Night* "is but a silly play," e che *Macbeth* è "pretty good." Ma Dryden prima, e poi Pope e Johnson, sia pure con molte riserve, spianarono la via ad una comprensione più approfondita.

L'estetica e la psicologia sociale possono in parte spiegare tali sbandamenti del gusto (e magari della moda), che gettano curiosi riflessi sui canoni del costume e della moralità; e il soggetto richiederebbe uno studio particolare, storico e teoretico. Ma qui si vuole soltanto fornire qualche dato positivo sull'argomento, quasi vorrei dire un breve diagramma della situazione del gusto e delle sue variazioni, per quanto riguarda l'area italiana.

Nel delineare un profilo dell'interesse e della comprensione del popolo italiano per Shakespeare, può essere magari istruttivo cominciare proprio dagli ultimi tratti, e cioè da alcune esperienze molto recenti e indicative di cose nuove.

Durante gli ultimi lustri, e specie negli orribili anni della guerra e del dopoguerra, in mezzo a disastri, morti, carestie e rovine, uscirono in Italia parecchi importanti volumi di traduzioni e di critica shakesperiana. Una specie di novecentesco *Sturm und Drang* italiano. In poco più di dieci anni apparivano due raccolte complete dei drammi, una dei sonetti e varie opere di critica estesa a tutto il periodo elisabettiano. Le grandi tragedie, specialmente *Otello, Amleto, Giulietta e Romeo*, venivano spesso rappresentate da compagnie italiane, e talora anche da comici inglesi, nella lingua originale. Nel maggio 1948, a Milano *Riccardo II* tenne il cartello per quaranta sere; e nel giugno seguente *La Tempesta* venne rappresentata all'aperto, nel giardino di Boboli a Firenze, si può dire per la prima volta in Italia (salvo tentativi locali di scarsa importanza). Anche il cinema portò al grande pubblico qualche stimolo, qualche lampo della poesia shakespeariana, sia pure approssimativo spesso. Nello spettacolo a Boboli, messo in scena abilmente, anche se con risultati un po' sconcertanti, il pubblico italiano vide per la prima volta gli zanni della *commedia dell'arte* sbizzarrirsi nei lazzi e nelle buffonate più esilaranti. Stefano e Trinculo (*two Neapolitans escaped*!) vennero rappresentati—come realmente devono essere, quali due pagliacci italiani, e addirittura come un pulcinella e un brighella (sulla legittimità di questa seconda maschera veneziana, ci sarebbe certo da discutere). Ma il pubblico italiano si domandava sbalordito come mai Shakespeare, poeta di Stratford, che verosimilmente non venne mai in Italia, potè raffigurare con tanta vivacità quelle tipiche maschere italiane, che oggi sopravvivono sopra tutto nel teatro dei burattini. In realtà nessuno *scenario* del cinque-seicento è rimasto tanto vivo e completo da essere rappresentabile oggi. Di quegli "scheletri" che sono gli scenari della commedia dell'arte, scheletri che hanno perduto le belle carni con cui l'arte dei nostri attori (ed attrici) sapevano adornarle, non ci rimane infatti che le pietosa memoria. Ma fu proprio un poeta inglese (solo più tardi giunsero, a modo loro, Molière e Goldoni) che colse per primo gli spunti comici e fantastici della commedia

dell'arte, nata poco prima nel vivaio teatrale della corte di Mantova, e verso la fine del cinquecento già diffusa, attraverso le rappresentazioni dei nostri comici girovaghi, in tutta Europa. Shakespeare insomma mi sembra, nelle scene degli zanni della *Tempesta*, il primo realizzatore poetico d'uno scenario della commedia popolare italiana.

Così il pubblico italiano, nell'anno 1948, potè assistere ad una rappresentazione di una sua commedia popolare "improvvisata" (e quindi morta coi divi che l'avevano qualche secolo prima interpretata) nella forma poetica e scenicamente valida, della *Tempesta* di Shakespeare. Fu un'esperienza indimenticabile, per chi conosceva le vicende di questo singolare prestito; ma la maggioranza non capì la cosa, e accettò con stupore sospettoso quanto le veniva presentato. Si aggiunga che lo stupore veniva ancora accresciuto dal fatto di assistere nel tempo stesso, ad una commedia romanzesca inglese, anzi forse composta per nozze principesche (si ricordi la rappresentazione alla corte inglese, nell'inverno 1612-13, per le nozze della principessa Elisabetta con l'Elettore palatino), nella quale però i personaggi sono tutti italiani; anzi addirittura milanesi e napoletani. Ma perchè tutta questa mistura di fantastica magia e di crudo realismo italiano?

Dopo tante indagini erudite sulle fonti shakespeariane, la recente ambientazione italiana della *Tempesta* ha avuto il valore psicologico di una vera controprova di controllo. Shakespeare aveva utilizzato, per la sua fiaba allegorica, materiale drammatico italiano, variamente contaminato, secondo la sua nota pratica, con una commedia tedesca (*Die schöne Sidea*), e con molto altro ancora; se pure non si possa collegare la fantastica simbologia del lavoro con alcuna definita fonte libresca. Ma che l'elemento più propriamente teatrale, il racconto cioè i tipi, siano colti dagli scenari della commedia popolare italiana, nessuno, credo, potrà oramai più dubitare. La recente interpretazione della *Tempesta* data nel giardino di Boboli, conferma in modo indubbio tale origine anche filologicamente accertabile. Tanto gli attori che il pubblico ed il regista si trovarono tutti, istintivamente, d'accordo nel riconoscere nel buon mago Prospero uno dei caratteri del nostro teatro popolare, e in Trinculo e Stefano (e fino ad un certo punto anche in Calibano, l'*omo salvatico* cioè degli scenari dell'*Arcadia incantata*, che furono raccolti nel 1618 da Basilio Locatelli, ma che fin dalla fine del secolo erano noti e rappresentati) i tipici zanni della commedia dell'arte.

Questa informazione di cronaca teatrale contemporanea, non è che l'indice conclusivo di una complessa situazione di storia della cultura e del gusto, che va indietro un paio di secoli. Se vogliamo sommariamente delineare gli aspetti più significativi della fortuna di Shakespeare in Italia, nel loro carattere psicologico, più che nei particolari documentari già spesse volte studiati, dobbiamo infatti rifarci alla prima metà del

settecento, quando si alza il sipario europeo sulla cultura inglese, che appare allora in tutta la sua maestà, onde decade il motto fino allora prevalente; *anglicum est, non legitur.*

Nelle storie della critica shakespeariana l'area italiana rimase a lungo trascurata. Il mio illustre e compianto amico, C. H. Herford, poteva scrivere ancora nel 1924, che " . . . in Latin Europe, outside France, he [Shakespeare] has won on the whole . . . only the homage of a distant and barren admiration."[1]

Nello stesso anno Augustus Ralli limitava la sua raccolta di dati sull'argomento, soltanto all'Inghilterra, alla Francia, alla Germania.[2]

Certamente la scarsa conoscenza della lingua inglese fra gli studiosi italiani ha impedito per lungo tempo l'adeguata comprensione dei valori poetici del grande tragico in Italia; e l'intermediario culturale francese per lo più ha deformato e sviato una corretta visione dell'immenso mondo shakespeariano. Ma se è mancata una profonda interpretazione critica paragonabile a quella della Germania, dove l'idealismo dello *Sturm und Drang* si è in parte infiammato proprio nel nome di Shakespeare, che le affinità di stirpe e di lingua potevano illuminare di una luce quasi di magico incantesimo, non sono però mancate in Italia le intuizioni della grandezza di quella poesia, specie attraverso le espressioni della musica romantica e dell'arte drammatica. Ma vediamo di fissare alcuni punti e di dare qualche nuova indicazione, che possa servire, spero, a mettere in più giusta luce il contributo italiano alla critica shakesperiana.

Vorrei fare innanzi tutto una riserva circa la presunta ignoranza da parte degli intellettuali italiani della lingua inglese. Naturalmente le lingue moderne non erano nel sette e anche nell'ottocento studiate e comprese come lo sono oggi. Occorre rendersi conto di quello che era l'atmosfera culturale europea nei giorni, poniamo, di Swift, di Montesquieu, di Paolo Rolli. Gli scambi intellettuali erano limitati al tramite di poche persone e di qualche accademia, e le relazioni culturali venivano ancora condotte per lo più in latino. Ma questo non significa che non esistessero in Italia assai più persone di quanto non si creda che conoscevano bene la lingua inglese.

Da Lorenzo Magalotti, ad Antonio Conti, ad Antonio Cocchi (per non dire degli Italiani che, come il Leti, il Rolli e il Baretti, risiedettero a lungo a Londra) non erano pochi i buoni conoscitori dell'inglese. Alcuni lo conoscevano benissimo e potevano tradurre direttamente dall'inglese, con competenza.

Recentemente ebbi occasione di esaminare i copiosi diari (una cinquantina di quadernetti) tenuti dal celebre medico e naturalista fioren-

[1] Cf. C. H. Herford, *A Sketch of the History of Shakespeare's Influence on the Continent* (Manchester, 1924), p. 6.

[2] Cf. Augustus Ralli, *A History of Shakesperian Criticism* (Oxford, 1924).

tino, Antonio Cocchi (1695-1752).[3] Questo insigne studioso si rivela in questi suoi diari sopra tutto un eccellente linguista. Mentre le notizie quasi cotidianamente annotate hanno scarsa importanza, riflettendo esse soltanto i particolari esterni delle faccende cotidiane (purtroppo prive anche della salacità e dell'umorismo di un Samuel Pepys), il dato linguistico riveste invece notevole interesse.

Fin dalla prima gioventù il Cocchi s'era messo tenacemente allo studio delle lingue: latino, greco, ebraico, francese, inglese, tedesco; e gran parte di questo suo *journal* è scritto in un mosaico di varie lingue, e particolarmente in greco e in inglese. E l'inglese del Cocchi è tutt'altro che cattivo, e migliora assai dopo il suo viaggio a Londra (1722-23); dove s'incontrò col Rolli, con la duchessa di Shrewsbury (nata Paleotti), col musicista Bononcini, e con molti altri. Fa un certo effetto leggere le note, un po' scarabocchiate, di questo fiorentino, che scriveva in parte il suo diario in lingua inglese: "It rained all night. In the morning in my study alone. Ordered the papers, then drunk chocolate with Abbé Franceschi, ecc....."

A Londra il Cocchi aveva letto molto; specialmente le opere di Locke, di cui trascrive estratti, di Milton, di T. Burnett. Non manca di nominare anche Shakespeare, disgraziatamente senza approfondire il tema, come invece fa per Milton, di cui fra l'altro scrive:

> . . . nel poema di Milton mi piacquero i caratteri e i sentimenti di Adamo ed Eva, e quei personaggi ov'ei parla di cose umane o di cui io avea chiare imagini nella mente. E non mi piacquero nè i suoi Diavoli nè gli Angioli, nè il carattere e i sentimenti ch'ei dà al figliuol di Dio o a Dio medesimo, nè le altre sue rappresentazioni . . .

Altri commenti del Cocchi alle sue visite londinesi, etoniane ed oxoniensi qui non ci interessano. È bastato notare che un medico fiorentino del primo settecento viaggiava in Inghilterra conoscendo benissimo la lingua inglese, e citando anche il nome, sia pur fugacemente, del grande poeta; che del resto era già stato ricordato, mezzo secolo prima, da Lorenzo Magalotti. Infatti la prima menzione italiana del nome di Shakespeare io credo di averla trovata in un codicetto inedito del 1667,[4] nel quale l'anonimo autore (che io ritengo essere il Magalotti) nomina i maggiori poeti d'Inghilterra, e fra gli altri ricorda *Shakespier* [*sic*].

Buoni conoscitori della lingua inglese furono anche i letterati Anton Maria Salvini, Scipione Maffei, Francesco Albergati, e più tardi i fratelli Verri e i due Pindemonte; questi ultimi veri preromantici di gusti e di sensibilità molto affini a quelle dei poeti e critici laghisti inglesi.

---

[3] Biblioteca medica di Careggi, *Effemeridi* di Antonio Cocchi, *Mss.* 2-2-32, dal 1720 al 1749.

[4] Per un esame di tale codice si veda il mio libro: *Civiltà italiana e civiltà inglese* (Firenze, 1936), pp. 169-180.

È interessante notare che le osservazioni dei letterati italiani di quel tempo sull'opera di Shakespeare non erano tutte convenzionali e superficiali. Fin dal 1729, e cioè prima che gli scritti di Voltaire avessero voga, Paolo Rolli espresse giudizi molto acuti circa le probabili interpolazioni nei drammi shakespeariani, sul valore morale dei drammi storici e su altro. Egli infatti, nella sua *Vita di Milton,* premessa alla traduzione di *Paradise Lost,* scrive:

> . . . io fermamente asserisco che quello che nelle sue stampate opere leggesi, o non sublime, o inelegante, o disdicevole, insomma tutto quello ove non si scorge Sh., non è altrimenti suo, ma de' suoi contemporanei Commedianti, che v'aggiungeano del loro proprio quel che stimavano o per esperienza sapevano recar diletto alle turbe.

Il Rolli conosceva bene Shakespeare, e sapeva discriminare l'opera genuina del poeta da quelle scene che potevano essere frutto di collaborazione o addirittura di interpolazione, dovuta a mestieranti che miravano soltanto a compiacere al volgo. Il Rolli non fa questione di pregiudizi accademici secondo le regole aristoteliche, ma vede giusto, seguendo soltanto il suo buon gusto e la sua sensibilità di poeta; e già al principio del settecento indica le possibilità esegetiche di quella che ai nostri giorni venne chiamata la critica "disgregatrice."

Altro merito critico del Rolli è quello di aver data molta importanza ai drammi storici nazionali, che furono solo più tardi apprezzati:

> Questo prodigioso ingegno è tanto più tale, quanto dicesi che non fosse stato educato per le Scienze, anzi che neppure sapesse la latina lingua, il che io non credo; scrisse alcune tragedie che io chiamerei istoriche, poichè rappresentano tratti istorici dei Re e Patrizi illustri della sua nazione: ed in queste i fatti ed i caratteri de' Personaggi interlocutori sono così vivi e poeticamente con adattatissimo stile espressi, che nulla più. Esempio che io vorrei che nelle altre Nazioni fosse seguito, perchè una e la migliore intenzione del Teatro è quella di istruire . . .

Luigi Riccoboni mostrò invece soltanto orrore per l'atrocità della tragedia inglese, e si domandava come mai gli inglesi, che sono umani e miti, potessero invece essere così feroci e crudeli nel teatro. Francesco Algarotti esprime analoghi pensieri di orrore; ma scrivendo a Muzio Spada nel 1757, esprime qualche giudizio acuto a proposito del sentimento della romanità nel *Giulio Cesare*:

> I veri sentimenti dei romani debbono assai facilmente innestarsi alle anime inglesi, poco o niente rammollite dalla galanteria, nutrite di spettacoli anzi feroci che no, e use in un governo quasi fortunato; che ha molta analogia con la repubblica romana.

Francesco Algarotti, Agostino Paradisi e F. S. Quadrio, autore di un primo tentativo di storia letteraria universale (1739-52), non aggiungono nulla di vivo, et ripetono le solite accuse accademiche contro Shake-

speare, violatore delle regole aristoteliche. Il Quadrio condanna "le sue farse mostruose che si chiamavan tragedie . . ."

Credo che il solo spirito del tempo che avrebbe potuto dare giudizi molto più penetranti, se avesse direttamente conosciuto i drammi shakespeariani, sarebbe stato G. B. Vico. La sua profonda intuizione della barbarie poetica, della eroica primitività, del mito illuminante, indicano il Vico come uno dei veri precursori della rivalutazione romantica della poesia. Vico, che aveva rivendicato la grandezza di Dante, giustamente paragona il "colerico ingegno" dei tragici elisabettiani alla grandiosa atrocità di Dante: ". . . come oggi gli inglesi, poco ammolliti dalla delicatezza del secolo, non si dilettano di tragedie che non abbiano dell'atroce." Vico naturalmente pensava al romanticismo tragico dell'*Inferno* dantesco ed alle *tragedies of blood and revenge* degli elisabettiani; ma una giustapposizione poetica e religiosa fra Dante e le più alte espressioni del teatro elisabettiano ci sembra molto suggestiva e ben fondata, ed era degno del Vico di istituirla.

Ma oltre all'intuizione vaga del Vico, abbiamo alcune prese di posizione degli scrittori più vivi verso la metà del settecento, che non dovrebbero essere dimenticate. Un quadro monocromo di quel periodo, come se fosse tutto pervaso dal grigiore di un gretto accademismo senza reazioni, non può essere certamente esatto. Basti pensare anche a Goldoni, a Metastasio, a Baretti; e fra i minori al Bicchierai e al Pignotti. Goldoni esalta Shakespeare e protesta fin dal 1756 contro "l'ingiurioso legame" delle regole aristoteliche; e Metastasio nel 1754, in una lettera al Calzabigi, afferma di voler informarsi del teatro straniero, specie di quello inglese, ch'egli leggerà poi in traduzione; e si dichiara anche avverso alle restrizioni classicheggianti e tutte le regole accademiche. Ma queste ribellioni restavano poi platoniche, e l'opportunismo e la tepidezza prevalevano.

Più energico, ma con minore ingegno, si mostrò Lorenzo Pignotti, che si oppose agli aridi convenzionalismi letterari, ed in un suo poemetto, *La tomba di Shakespeare,* delineò un raffronto fra il pettinato giardino francese ed il libero parco inglese (1779).

Il brillante e caustico Giuseppe Baretti, che fece parte a Londra del circolo del dottor Johnson, è ben noto per il suo atteggiamento più ardito. Nella sua famosa polemica contro Voltaire, egli difese Dante e Shakespeare (due imputati che avevano allora bisogno di difesa!) contro le critiche illuministiche del pontefice francese. La sua opera in tal senso è troppo nota, e basta solo ricordarla qui. Il Baretti, che non fu sempre critico equilibrato è, a proposito di Shakespeare, molto avveduto, e rileva giustamente la potente delineazione dei caratteri shakespeariani: notevole specialmente, dati i tempi, la sua ammirazione per l' "invenzione" di Calibano:

Anche nei più trascurati drammi v'è un notabile numero di tratti superlativamente luminosi, che nessuno ha mai potuto agguagliare, che forse non saranno mai più agguagliati da nessuno...

Tra i più meravigliosi caratteri di Sh., io non posso abbastanza ammirare quello di "Caliban." Bisogna avere un cervello molto poetico per inventare un tal uomo, renderlo totalmente verosimile ad onta dell'impossibilità della sua esistenza!

Ma l'anglomania italiana del settecento era naturalmente orientata verso gusti diversi. Milton, Pope e poi Thomson e Young ed altri minori, tenevano il campo, insieme ai maggiori saggisti, filosofi e romanzieri; che vennero tradotti e spesso imitati, ma con risultati in genere assai poveri e non fecondi di vigorose ispirazioni. Shakespeare faceva paura, ma non ispirava, nè poteva essere veramente compreso pienamente.

Anche per quanto riguarda le traduzioni, l'attenzione degli italiani è contemporanea a quella delle altre grandi nazioni europee. La prima traduzione tedesca fu quella del *Julius Caesar* curata dal von Borck nel 1741; e pochi anni dopo, nel 1756, appariva pei tipi dell'editore Bindi di Siena la prima traduzione italiana della stessa tragedia, opera del canonico Domenico Valentini, professore di storia ecclesiastica.

Ma c'era una differenza. Mentre il von Borck traduceva direttamente dall'originale, il Valentini non conosceva una parola di lingua inglese; e non poteva servirsi neppure delle versioni contemporanee del von Borck e del La Place; ma si affidava invece all'aiuto di amici inglesi, i quali gli avevano interpretata *verbatim* la tragedia. Si trattava quindi di un'opera di approssimazione, del resto abbastanza accurata. Questa scarsa conoscenza dell'originale pesò spesso sulle traduzioni italiane delle opere di Shakespeare, del sette e dell'ottocento, ancorchè in alcuni casi la conoscenza del testo fosse più approfondita di quanto non si creda, come ho già detto ed ho cercato di mostrare.

Mancò agli italiani un interprete veramente completo, filologicamente e spiritualmente preparato come A. W. Schlegel, che favorisse una intelligente lettura dei testi ed una costruttiva penetrazione critica; ovvero un geniale poeta, che sapesse fare qualcosa di simile alla "ricreazione" che Vincenzo Monti fece di Omero, o il Cesarotti di Ossian. E mancò anche la possibilità di vedere Shakespeare sulla scena, rappresentato da comici inglesi; mentre nei paesi germanici, fin dal primo seicento, si ebbero compagnie drammatiche inglesi che recitavano i grandi drammi, specie presso le corti dei principi, dove trovavano un pubblico capace di comprenderli appieno. Si può ricordare che la prima comparsa di un dramma di Shakespeare sulle scene italiane pare abbia avuto luogo a Venezia, nel 1774, quando venne rappresentato *Amleto*, nella versione di Francesco Gritti, tratta dal testo francese del Ducis.

Intanto Alessandro Verri traduceva *Otello* e *Amleto* (1777); e più tardi la geniale Giustina Renier Michiel preparava, con le sue versioni,

la via alle molte traduzioni dell'ottocento: quelle di Michele Leoni, di Soncini e Bazzoni, del Nicolini, e le più note e complete di Carlo Rusconi e di Giulio Carcano. L'età romantica risvegliò in Italia l'interesse per le letterature nazionali dei paesi nordici : e già con Alfieri, con Monti, con Foscolo il presagio di una misteriosa forza nuova che erompeva dalla tragedia shakespeariana era stato chiaramente avvertito. Vincenzo Monti sparse lagrime assistendo a Venezia, nel 1785, ad una rappresentazione della *Tragedia veronese* (cioè *Romeo and Juliet*). Qualche lustro più tardi il giovane Foscolo farà altrettanto; mentre Byron piangerà ad una rappresentazione dell'alfieriana *Mirra*. Queste lacrime generali possono assumere significati simbolici di costumi e di sensibilità trapassate. Gli uomini mai rivelano meglio il loro animo più segreto che attraverso il pianto e il riso. È l'indifferenza dell'anonima umanità civile moderna, che non sa più nè ridere nè piangere, neppure di fronte ad ottime ragioni per farlo, è rivelatrice di importanti carenze sentimentali e di giustificabili ottundimenti psichici.

Queste care lacrime dei poeti noi le comprendiamo, e magari le invidiamo loro; esse rivelano non soltanto il mutamento di un gusto letterario (che sarebbe ben poca cosa), ma l'approfondirsi della sensibilità morale, l'arricchirsi dell'interiorità e di una visione più elevata, cioè tragica, della vita. Sono queste lacrime che preluderanno alla nuova cultura, di cui il giornale *Il Conciliatore* (1818-19) sarà il nobile araldo; e saranno i redattori del "foglio azzurro" Silvio Pellico, Giovanni Berchet, Giandomenico Romagnosi, il Di Breme, il Visconti, il Confalonieri, a preparare gli animi e il gusto per quella rinascita morale e culturale che aprirà le vie alla comprensione di Shakespeare, di cui Alessandro Manzoni, Giuseppe Mazzini, Giuseppe Verdi saranno i veri cultori.

Questa rivoluzione sopra tutto milanese, insieme poetica e morale, finì anche con il convertire il "milanais" Stendhal; il quale invece poco prima aveva allegramente scritto che "la plus belle tragédie de Shakespeare ne produit pas sur moi la moitié de l'effect d'un ballet de Vigano."

Alessandro Manzoni, con la sua ironica battuta nella lettera allo Chauvet, sul "barbaro che non era privo d'ingegno," conclude con piena adeguatezza la vertenza Voltaire-Shakespeare. Da allora il poeta inglese diviene un nome comune del vocabolario italiano; e la musica romantica popolare trasferì il suo messaggio poetico, sia pure in parte deformato (ma non tanto) dalla sfera della cultura a quella più vasta del popolo. Anche Gino Capponi, Vincenzo Gioberti, Niccolò Tommaseo non furono insensibili al richiamo della poesia shakespeariana; e insomma tutto il nostro ottocento più vivo e sensibile ne fu, in vario modo, consapevole.

Manzoni, Mazzini, Verdi; e si deve aggiungere Francesco de Sanctis. Con questi grandi nomi noi entriamo nel vivo della visione shakespearia-

na del mondo in Italia. Abbinandolo a Dante, Verdi chiamava Shakespeare "il gran maestro del cuore umano"; Manzoni lo ebbe sempre presente, specie in quel mirabile decennio 1820-30 che segnò la più alta temperie del suo genio creativo. Mazzini lo sentiva moralisticamente, come sintesi e conclusione di un'epoca. De Sanctis lo additò come esempio di suprema poesia, modello insuperato di arte tragica.

La visione tragica del mondo, tipica della poesia shakespeariana, mi sembra potentemente compresa e trasfigurata nelle creazioni poetiche di Manzoni e di Verdi, in modi e forme loro proprie. I caratteri di Adelchi, di Ermengarda, di Fra Cristoforo non sarebbero stati gli stessi senza i fantasmi di Amleto, di Caterina d'Aragona, di Fra Lorenzo. I drammi di Shakespeare hanno rivelato agli itialiani mondi poetici e morali che, insieme a quelli di Dante, contribuirono a formare nuovi misteriosi approfondimenti e arricchimenti di coscienze, durante tutto il periodo del risorgimento.

Ma sopratutto nel caso di Giuseppe Verdi mi sembra importante questa ispirazione di spiriti nuovi. È un errore considerare Verdi come un autore di opere in musica soltanto; o per meglio dire bisogna intendere che le opere di Verdi (e in parte quelle di Bellini e Donizetti) sono le grandi tragedie popolari italiane. Il teatro italiano, così povero di opere tragiche che non siano mere imitazioni accademiche, trovò nell'opera verdiana l'espressione più intima, umile, genuina dei propri dolori, delle proprie miserie, del tragico patos del vivere, della fatalità interiore. Dalle melodie della *Forza del Destino*, del *Ballo in Maschera* del *Trovatore*, dell'*Otello*, erompe lo strazio di tutto un popolo. Ed è importante osservare che il creatore di queste opere considerò per tutta la vita Dante, Shakespeare e Manzoni quali suoi supremi maestri; e le tragedie di Shakespeare studiò con intelligente e appassionato fervore.

L'epistolario di Verdi ci rivela questo suo costante e appassionato studio: specialmente di *Macbeth*, di *King Lear*, di *Othello*, e dei drammi falstaffiani. Quando si considera che sia scarso il contributo italiano alla comprensione di Shakespeare, si commette il grande errore di considerare solamente i contributi della critica erudita, come se questo fosse tutto. Ma c'è evidentemente dell'altro.

I musicisti italiani furono attratti dal teatro shakespeariano come forse da nessun' altra opera poetica moderna. Le loro interpretazioni musicali, alcune delle quali sono capolavori, mi pare che costituiscano non solo un tributo profondo di comprensione, ma spesso anche un'opera di vero approfondimento critico.

Potrà sembrare sorprendente che si possano contare solo in Italia una cinquantina di composizioni musicali (quasi tutte opere) ispirate da temi shakespeariani. Credo che il dramma più popolare presso i nostri musicisti sia stato quello di Giulietta e Romeo. Basti ricordare, su

questo tema, le opere di Vincenzo Bellini (*Capuleti e Montecchi,* 1830), di F. Marchetti (1865) e di Riccardo Zandonai (1922). Altri drammi ispirarono Saverio Mercadante, Gioacchino Rossini, Giuseppe Verdi, su fino ai contemporanei Felice Lattuada, Francesco Malipiero, Vito Frazzi, Mario Castelnuovo Tedesco ed altri.

Circa i melodrammi antichi italiani, tratti da temi della poesia di Shakespeare, c'è da restare in dubbio. Si potrebbe anche sollevare un problema di estetica circa la natura dell'ispirazione esercitata da un certo libretto sul compositore musicale; e si deve ammettere che il più delle volte lo stimolo poetico di un dato dramma shakespeariano rimase soltanto generico e occasionale.

In qualche caso si sarà trattato di semplice identità di soggetto; come nel caso di un libretto di Apostolo Zeno intitolato *Amleto,* che è da richiamarsi piuttosto a Saxo Grammatico che a Shakespeare. Potrà darsi che Francesco Cavalli, durante la sua permanenza alla corte di Francia, abbia conosciuto le riduzioni shakespeariane curate in quel tempo dal Dryden e dal Davenant, da Matthew Locke e dall'italiano Draghi. Però il Cavalli, geniale musicista, ma non pensoso artista come il suo maestro Monteverdi, era notoriamente noncurante dei temi musicati, e del resto quella seconda metà del seicento vide le più goffe contaminazioni di elementi musicali, recitativi, coreografici, che cercavano una sintesi artistica. Era il tempo delle *tragédies à machines,* delle *comédies de chansons* e di consimili generi ibridi, nei quali Philippe Quinault e G. B. Lulli furono maestri. Nulla quindi restava di shakespeariano nelle riduzioni musicate dal Cavalli, da Carlo Francesco Pollarolo, dal Gasparini; poichè il musicista prendeva poco più che il titolo del dramma. Ma lo studio e la comprensione dei musicisti andò crescendo e approfondendosi col tempo, fino a diventare, nel caso di Verdi una suprema fratellanza di eccelsa poesia. Mentre Rossini e Bellini rimasero ancora alla superficie (le loro opere tratte da Shakespeare sono poco più che improvvisazioni: *Otello* fu composto in venti giorni, *Capuleti e Montecchi* in quaranta), Giuseppe Verdi fu, oltre che musicista, studioso appassionato, vero interprete della poesia e del pensiero di Shakespeare.

Dopo aver musicato *Macbeth,* opera mancata, Verdi ideò di musicare *King Lear,* tragedia che lo affascinava, ma che non potè mai dominare appieno, anche per le difficoltà tecniche di quel dramma "cosmico," che gli parvero insormontabili. Si accordò poi con Boito per un libretto tratto da *Othello.* Nel carteggio Verdi-Boito su questo argomento, abbiamo brani di lettere che interessano la critica shakespeariana.

Boito studiò a fondo Shakespeare; e nelle sue lettere a Verdi discute minutamente i pregi artistici del poeta, e si addentra spesso ad esaminare anche questioni filologiche riguardanti le fonti. Per l'*Otello,* egli considera che la novella di Giraldi Cinzio sia un racconto tratto dal vero,

da un fatto storico contemporaneo; e qui mi pare che Boito abbia visto giusto. Egli scrive: "La mia convinzione intima è che quella novella sia tratta dal vero, se non in tutti i particolari, certamente nel suo insieme....."

Quando Verdi volle scrivere un'opera comica, egli si rivolse ancora al "papà di tutti." Rossini aveva negato che Verdi potesse riuscire nel genere comico; ma la scelta del tema di Falstaff dimostrò invece non solo le sue immense possibilità, ma anche l'acume mirabile della scelta. Il tema di Falstaff era sì, comico; ma di un comico altamente complesso e poetico, non soltanto degno di opera buffa. Infatti Verdi, quasi all'età di ottant'anni, si preparò alla composizione della nuova opera con la lettura accurata non solo delle *Merry Wives,* ma anche delle due parti di *Henry IV* e di *Henry V*. Egli rivisse con Boito l'atmosfera falstaffiana, tutto preso dal grande soggetto; e l'immenso Sir John, "il pancione" come lo chiamavano, diventa il tema delle loro conversazioni e corrispondenze. Come Verdi penetrasse a fondo nella delineazione psicologica dell'eroe appare dai supremi risultati artistici realizzati e dalle sue stesse dichiarazioni e commenti interpretativi. Egli scrive fra l'altro: "Non faccio un'opera buffa ma rappresento un tipo." In questa verace affermazione sta la sua ragion poetica, l'indicazione del suo proposito creativo, quasi di integrazione e continuazione shakespeariana.

Anche l'acceso romanticismo di Arrigo Boito si polarizzò nel culto di Dante e di Shakespeare (e tra i suoi contemporanei si rivolse a Victor Hugo e a Baudelaire). Nel 1862 egli si pose al lavoro per scrivere un libretto tratto da *Hamlet* per il musicista Franco Faccio. Boito, con questo libretto, risolleva in una sfera di alta poesia il melodramma come opera letteraria. È interessante notare che egli fa parlare lo spettro del re in terzine dantesche, con un'intuizione poetica suggestiva. C'è da rammaricarsi che Boito, uomo singolarmente dotato, non abbia lasciato opere critiche più organiche a testimoniare la sua cultura e il suo gusto per Dante e per Shakespeare. Ma a lui va riconosciuto il merito d'essere stato, attraverso la corrispondenza e la conversazione, un eccezionale animatore, appassionato dell'arte, per la quale viveva.

Sembra che Boito avesse in animo di preparare due altri libretti; e cioè un *Antonio e Cleopatra* e un *Re Lear,* l'ossessione di Verdi, che già nel 1853 aveva scritto:

> Ho riletto il "Re Lear" che è meravigliosamente bello; se non che mi spaventa il dover ridurre sì smisurata tela a proporzioni brevi, conservando l'originalità e la grandezza dei caratteri del dramma...

Il Nardi recentemente trovò fra le carte di Boito un appunto per una prima stesura di *Re Lear;* ma l'opera rimase poi tra le molte non realizzate.

Nel carteggio verdiano i giudizi su Shakespeare sono frequenti. In una lettera alla contessa Maffei scrive:

> ... copiare il vero può essere una buona cosa, ma inventare il vero è meglio, molto meglio. Pare vi sia contraddizione in queste tre parole: "inventare il vero" ma domandatelo al Papà [Sh.]. Può darsi che egli, il Papà, si sia trovato con qualche Falstaff, ma difficilmente avrà trovato uno scellerato come Jago, e mai e poi mai degli angeli come Cordelia, Imogene, Desdemona, ecc. eppure sono tanto veri!

Una degna considerazione dovrebbero meritare anche gli attori e le attrici che seppero interpretare con superiore intelligenza il teatro shakespeariano. Per lo più non ci hanno lasciato saggi critici sull'argomento, nè hanno scritto libri importanti. Ma l'emozione e il sentimento della loro recitazione si sono propagati in un vasto pubblico. Non si può trascurare questo fuoco di spiritualità, anche se il suo calore è ormai spento.

I nobili cuori di Adelaide Ristori e di Eleonora Duse, di Gustavo Modena, di Ernesto Rossi, di Tommaso Salvini, di Guglielmo Emanuel, di Ermete Novelli, per ricordare soltanto i maggiori tra gli scomparsi, hanno dato tutto il meglio del loro fervore, nelle interpretazioni di Giulietta o di Cleopatra, di Otello, di Amleto, di Re Lear.

Bisogna ricordare quale interprete squisita di Shakespeare fu Eleonora Duse, e quale intima comprensione ella avesse dei più profondi valori della sua poesia. Quando Boito tradusse per lei l'*Antonio e Cleopatra* (1887) essa fu rapita. Lì poteva essere veramente lei stessa, una donna viva, e lo dice con caratteristica vivezza: "O quel Sardou! . . . Basta con le Fedore, con le Odette . . . Cleopatra, ecco una creatura umana!" La Duse passò molte notti a studiare quella tragedia, che l'amato Boito le commentava, alla quale la spronava e incoraggiava perchè ne desse un'interpretazione degna. E infatti la Duse trionfò in *Antonio e Cleopatra*, e subito dopo si preparò a mettere in scena *Giulietta e Romeo*.

Boito fu il commentatore shakespeariano della Duse, come fu l'ideale collaboratore di Verdi; egli non si limitava alla lettura dei drammi, ma studiava i problemi di cronologia, di fonti e di critica estetica, come appare dal suo carteggio. Certo, il suo studio era fatto, più che sugli originali, su opere francesi; e la traduzione di François Victor Hugo fu il suo maggior sussidio nella preparazione dei suoi libretti.

Il progresso degli studi nell'ultimo mezzo secolo, gli sviluppi della critica e della filologia hanno prodotto anche in Italia un profondo rivolgimento: anzi forse più in Italia che in altri paesi, poichè il naturale cosmopolitismo degli italiani li ha orientati verso un processo di larga ricezione delle lingue e delle letterature straniere. Per quanto riguarda lo studio di Shakespeare, abbiamo già notato un vero risveglio. Le

traduzioni si sono moltiplicate, e quello che più conta, affinate poeticamente, sempre più vicine agli originali. Non tutte, certo, ma alcune si possono considerare ottime, specie talune di singoli drammi (Chiarini, Celenza, Errante, ecc.) . Le traduzioni complete di Angeli e dei tre volumi sansoniani (di diversi traduttori) sono molto ineguali, ma in genere abbastanza fedeli, se non sempre poetiche e tonalmente adeguate. Le ricerche erudite e gli studi critici apparsi negli ultimi lustri hanno contribuito qualchecosa di vivo e di originale alla critica shakespeariana moderna (Croce, Farinelli, De Lorenzo, Rebora, ecc.) . Esiste oggi in Italia un buon gruppo di anglisti e di critici del teatro, che sono bene aggiornati nel vasto scibile della filologia shakespeariana.

Se durante il seicento nessuno sapeva chi fosse Shakespeare, se nel settecento lo sapevano in pochi e male, se nell'ottocento in parecchi, ma un poco melodrammaticamente, in questo secolo Shakespeare è diventato, per gli italiani colti, una delle forze poetiche più care e più vive e operanti.

Tale comprensione non è più oggi limitata ai quattro o cinque drammi famosi, ma si allarga a tutto il mondo shakespeariano; inoltre l'interesse non è più concentrato nell'intreccio od al più nei caratteri, ma si diffonde anche agli essenziali valori della dizione poetica, delle immagini, degli effetti verbali e ritmici del testo. Una maggiore conoscenza linguistica ed una più approfondita coscienza del potere rivelatore della parola e del verso, hanno preparato gli italiani colti a "capire" oggi Shakespeare nella sua pienezza; mentre il grande pubblico sempre meglio lo apprezza nelle rappresentazioni sceniche o nelle versioni musicali di alcuni dei drammi più famosi. Se tre secoli e mezzo fa il grande poeta aveva intuito con la luce del genio, la verità psicologica della vita romana, e certi tratti meno ovvi, più intimi, degli italiani del rinascimento, è bello che oggi, dopo tanto spazio di tempo, si possa dire che infine gli italiani abbiano pienamente "capito" *lui*.

Dunque, la buona conoscenza delle lingue straniere, l'accurato studio dei testi letterari, l'opera di traduzione e la critica sempre meglio aggiornate, hanno enormemente accresciuto la capacità di comprensione fra i vari popoli del mondo, nei campi delle loro espressioni spirituali. Sopratutto si è raffinata la sensibilità del gusto estetico e la ricerca della formazione psicologica. Oggi si possono leggere sintesi acutissime sui vari aspetti della vita di tutti i popoli; e lo studio metodico delle letterature comparate ha posto su solide basi la ricerca delle interrelazioni culturali e degli scambi intellettuali, con lo scopo, anche se non sempre dichiarato dai vari studiosi, di trovare dei comuni denominatori, dei punti di incontro (anche se magari contrastanti) delle affinità essenziali fra i diversi popoli. Potrà un giorno l'uomo religioso esemplato dai santi, o l'*homo philosophicus* dei demiurghi, affermare la sua predominanza spirituale

nel mondo, e condizionarne anche la tollerabile convivenza politica? Possiamo terminare con la drammatica invocazione di *Saint Joan*, nel capolavoro di Bernard Shaw: "O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints ? How long, O Lord, how long?" Sia questo auspicato avvento prossimo o lontano, gli studiosi di tutti i paesi cercheranno sempre di tessere, con pazienza certosina, l'immensa e forse interminabile tela della intelligenza di tutti i valori, della conoscenza intima e, fin che si può, della comprensione, che è superiore catarsi.

Firenze

THE EPIC STYLE OF THE PILGRIM AETHERIA

LEO SPITZER

. . . *ostendebantur juxta scripturas* (I, 1)

THE language of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae ad loca sancta* has been hitherto analyzed mainly from the point of view of the source material it offers for the study of the development of Vulgar Latin in the fourth (or sixth) century, of the "Romanisms" it may contain, and of the abandonment of classical types of expression it reveals. The stylistic personality of the author has been neglected because Aetheria's way of writing has not been considered as a self-contained phenomenon, but as a transitional link in a suprapersonal linguistic development. This gap the present study attempts to fill to some extent, by treating the *Peregrinatio* from the point of view of the literary genre it purports to represent: the account of a pilgrimage—for, strangely enough, the linguist's have treated Aetheria's language as if it moved in a vacuum and were not subordinated to literary or dogmatic patterns of thought imposed by the genre.[1] This study will then be in accord with other writ-

[1] Terracini, in his review of Miss A. G. Hatcher's book on the reflexives, *RFH*, VII, 13, formulated for the first time the principle that underlies the present study, that the style of Aetheria (and of the other writers of the same transitional Vulgar Latin period) has, "as much as that of Plautus or of Jules Romains," a right to be analyzed in itself and not merely as a "linguistic transition" between Latin and Romance. Terracini also saw that a careful stylistic analysis of the *Peregrinatio* would be helpful in dating more exactly the appearance of the main Romance linguistic features (the article, the future, the passive, etc.)—that is to say, in deciding whether a certain feature of Aetheria's language is already grammaticalized with her or whether, instead, it represents a deliberate, personal stylistic intent on the part of the particular writer. We show in this article that a confusion between style and grammar has led Löfstedt to assume that the use of *ipse*, which has with Aetheria a definite stylistic value characteristic of her writing, already foreshadows the Romance article.

I do not, however, find very convincing the sample analysis of Aetheria's "style" which Terracini offers us—that of her use of the reflexives—and precisely because he, against his own principle, does not sufficiently differentiate between grammaticalized and stylistic use. For example, he supposes that, in her use of the reflexives with verbs of bodily movement, Aetheria reveals her "feminine" sensitivity, susceptible to the fatigue of her pilgrimage; thus constructions such as (XXV, 7) "*Recipit se* episcopus et *uadent se* unusquisque ad ospitium suum, ut *se resumant*" or (XXIV, 12) "Mox autem *recipit se* episcopus *in domum* suam," are characteristic of Aetheria's "plastic-emotional" sensitivity to bodily

ings of mine in which I have attempted to bridge the chasm that existed at the beginning of our century between linguistics and literary history. And I shall also attempt to show (and this study is hereby linked to comparative literature) that epic patterns well known to us in mediaeval Romance poetry were latent in this early Vulgar Latin narrative.

In order to contrast my method with that of my predecessors, I may

---

movement and show in the reflexives the desire for rest—though in XXIV, 5, "*lebat se* episcopus [who had been sitting before] et stat ante cancellum," he would see the opposite emotional nuance. However, at least the two reflexives *se recipere, se resumere* need no individualistic explanation, representing as they do quite conventional classical Latin patterns. Furthermore, we might be convinced of the theory that Aetheria's use of the reflexives shows her fatigue if we were offered examples of such reflexives when Aetheria herself speaks—which Terracini has failed to find. In reality, as we shall point out in this study, all fatigue is excluded from the start with Aetheria, for whom *labor* is absent when *desiderium* moves her. Whenever some new landmark in the neighborhood is mentioned to her by her guides, she is immediately ready to inspect it. X, 9: "Quod cum dixisset, nos *satis auidi optati sumus* ire, et *statim diuertentes a uia* secuti sumus presbyterum." And I suppose that the bishop who is presented in the sentence, while the church celebration continues, "mox autem *recipit se* . . . in domum suam" (cf. "mox" with "statim" in the preceding quotation) is of the same mold as the narrator Aetheria; he is not tired but indefatigably obeys a code of ritualistic practice. His oversophisticated artistic "empathy" has led Terracini here to read into Aetheria's grammaticalized use of the reflexives nuances which rest only on his gratuitous assumption that Aetheria, a woman pilgrim, must have been a frail feminine being.

Sometimes again Terracini, in order to antedate a Romance construction, obviously misconstrues a perfectly conventional classical pattern. Who will believe that in XLIX, 2, "putat se maximum peccatum incurrisse, qui . . ." or III, 2, "cum tamen ita infiniti essent [montes] ut non me putarem aliquando altiores uidisse," we have to do with an impersonal *se putat=homo putat* (cf. It. *si crede*) instead of a simple construction of acc. c. inf. with *se, me* as subjects of the infinitive?

In regard to other features of Aetheria's style which Terracini examines, it can be shown that grammaticalization had already progressed much farther than he would admit. In XLIII, 5, "ille locus de euangelio, ubi *dicit* de ascensu *Domini*" ="where it says (reads) . . . ," it is probably true that *dicit* (instead of *dicitur*) must be explained by the fatalistic nuance of older impersonals such as *pluit, accidit*. But can we assume that this use was dictated to the writer by any particular personal emotion? This type of expression, current in citations (cf. Löfstedt's parallels), must have belonged to the most banal part of the language of that time where no personal emotion need be suspected.

It seems to me that Terracini's misinterpretations stem from a preconceived desire to find the whole stylistic personality of the author expressed in a particular construction which he has arbitrarily selected—Aetheria's use of the reflexives. Terracini, happening to review Miss Hatcher's book, missed therein a treatment of Aetheria's reflexives, whereupon he proceeded to fill this gap. Thus, his selection of the reflexives was made, probably not because in his previous reading of the *Peregrinatio* the use of the reflexives had forced itself on his attention, nor, apart from the reflexives, because he had previously been struck by any particular stylistic revelation of Aetheria's personality. According to my experience, it is always difficult to find the stylistic personality of a writer expressed in *just* this or that feature, chosen *ad hoc;* one must rather wait until one has been struck by some (quite unexpected) feature, which, in its own way, will lead one to the center of the work of art (cf. my book *Linguistics and Literary Scholarship*, p. 19).

start with the remark of Löfstedt in his classical book, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Upsala, 1911), p. 64, in regard to the repetitious usage of the pronoun *ipse* in *Peregrinatio*, XIX, 16 seq.:

postea . . . episcopus ait ad me: "eamus nunc ad portam, per quam ingressus est Ananias cursor cum illa epistola, quam dixeram." Cum ergo uenissemus ad portam ipsam, stans episcopus fecit orationem et legit nobis ibi ipsas epistolas et denuo bendicens nos facta est iterato oratio. Illud etiam retulit nobis sanctus ipse dicens, eo quod ex ea die, qua Ananias cursor per ipsam portam ingressus est cum epistolam Domini, usque in praesentem diem custodiatur, ne quis immundus, ne quis lugubris per ipsam portam transeat, sed nec corpus alicuius mortui eiciatur per ipsam portam.

For Löfstedt, as for E. Wölfflin and K. Meister, this use of *ipse* anticipates the Romance article (cf. Sardinian and Mallorcan *s(u)* "the") just as does the parallel weakened usage of *ille* (→Fr. *le*, Sp. *el*, etc.) in *Peregrinatio* XV, 1: "requisiui de eo quam longe esset ipse locus. Tunc ait *ille* sanctus presbyter." Now let us place the sentences with the many *ipse*'s, quoted by Löfstedt, in their original frame—I print here the whole passage, XIX, 4-19 (according to the edition of W. Heraeus, Heidelberg, 1929):

4. Ac sic ergo uidi in eadem ciuitatem martyria plurima nec non et sanctos monachos, commanentes alios per martyria, alios longius de ciuitate in secretioribus locis habentes monasteria. 5. Et quoniam sanctus episcopus ipsius ciuitatis, uir uere religiosus et monachus et confessor, suscipiens me libenter ait michi: "Quoniam uideo te, filia, gratia religionis tam magnum laborem tibi imposuisse, ut de extremis porro terris uenires ad haec loca, itaque ergo, si libenter habes, quaecumque loca sunt hic grata ad uidendum Christianis, ostendimus tibi": tunc ergo gratias agens Deo primum et sic ipsi rogaui plurimum, ut dignaretur facere quod dicebat. 6. Itaque ergo duxit me primum ad palatium Aggari regis et ibi ostendit michi archiotepam ipsius ingens simillimam, ut ipsi dicebant, marmoream, tanti nitoris ac si de margarita esset; in cuius Aggari uultu parebat de contra uere fuisse hunc uirum satis sapientem et honoratum. Tunc ait mihi sanctus episcopus: "Ecce rex Aggarus, qui antequam uideret Dominum, credidit ei, quia esset uere filius Dei." Nam erat et iuxta archiotipa similiter de tali marmore facta, quam dixit filii ipsius esse Magni, similiter et ipsa habens aliquid gratiae in uultu. 7. Item perintrauimus in interiori parte palatii; et ibi erant fontes piscibus pleni, quales ego adhuc nunquam uidi, id est tantae magnitudinis uel tam perlustres aut tam boni saporis. Nam ipsa ciuitas aliam aquam penitus non habet nunc nisi eam, quae de palatio exit, quae est ac si fluuius ingens argenteus. 8. Et nunc retulit michi de ipsa aqua sic sanctus episcopus dicens: "Quodam tempore, posteaquam scripserat Aggarus rex ad Dominum et Dominus rescripserat Aggaro per Ananiam cursorem, sicut scriptum est in ipsa epistola: transacto ergo aliquanto tempore superueniunt Perse et girant ciuitatem istam. 9. Sed statim Aggarus epistolam Domini ferens ad portam cum omni exercitu suo publice orauit. Et post dixit: "Domine Iesu, tu promiseras nobis, ne aliquis hostium ingrederetur ciuitatem istam, et ecce nunc Persae inpugnant nos." Quod cum dixisset tenens manibus leuatis epistolam ipsam

apertam rex, ad subito tantae tenebrae factae sunt, foras ciuitatem tamen ante oculos Persarum, cum iam prope plicarent ciuitati, ita ut usque tertium miliarium de ciuitate essent: sed ita mox tenebris turbati sunt, ut uix castra ponerent et pergirarent in miliario tertio totam ciuitatem. 10. Ita autem turbati sunt Persae, ut nunquam uiderent postea, qua parte in ciuitate ingrederentur, sed custodirent ciuitatem per giro clusam hostibus in miliario tamen tertio, quam tamen custodierunt mensibus aliquod. 11. Postmodum autem, cum uiderent se nullo modo posse ingredi in ciuitatem, uoluerunt siti eos occidere, qui in ciuitate erant. Nam monticulum istum, quem uides, filia, super ciuitate hac, in illo tempore ipse huic ciuitati aquam ministrabat. Tunc uidentes hoc Persae auerterunt ipsam aquam a ciuitate et fecerunt ei decursum contra ipso loco, ubi ipsi castra posita habebant. 12. In ea ergo die et in ea hora, qua auerterant Persae aquam, statim hii fontes, quos uides in eo loco, iusso Dei a semel eruperunt: ex ea die hi fontes usque in hodie permanent hic gratia Dei. Illa autem aqua, quam Persae auerterant, ita siccata est in ea hora, ut nec ipsi haberent uel una die quod biberent, qui obsedebant ciuitatem, sicut tamen et usque in hodie apparet; nam postea nunquam nec qualiscumque humor ibi apparuit usque in hodie. 13. Ac sic iubente Deo, qui hoc promiserat futurum, necesse fuit eos statim reuerti ad sua, id est in Persida. Nam et postmodum quotienscumque uoluerunt uenire et expugnare hanc ciuitatem hostes, haec epistola prolata est et lecta est in porta, et statim nutu Dei expulsi sunt omnes hostes." 14. Illud etiam retulit sanctus episcopus eo quod hii fontes ubi erup[ei]erunt, ante sic fuerit campus intra ciuitatem subiacens palatio Aggari. Quod palatium Aggari quasi in editiori loco positum erat, sicut et nunc paret, ut uides. Nam consuetudo talis erat in illo tempore, ut palatia, quotiensque fabricabantur, semper in editioribus locis fierent. 15. Sed postmodum quam hii fontes in eo loco eruperunt, tunc ipse Aggarus filio suo Magno, id est isti, cuius archiotipa uides iuxta patre posita, hoc palatium fecit in eo loco, ita tamen ut hii fontes intra palatium includerentur. 16. Postea ergo quam haec omnia retulit sanctus episcopus, ait ad me: "Eamus nunc ad portam, per quam ingressus est Ananias cursor cum illa epistola, quam dixeram." Cum ergo uenissemus ad portam ipsam, stans episcopus fecit orationem et legit nobis ibi ipsas epistolas et denuo bendicens nos facta est iterato oratio. 17. Illud etiam retulit nobis sanctus ipse dicens, eo quod ex ea die, qua Ananias cursor per ipsam portam ingressus est cum epistolam Domini, usque in praesentem diem custodiatur, ne quis immundus, ne quis lugubris per ipsam portam transeat, sed nec corpus alicuius mortui eiciatur per ipsam portam. 18. Ostendit etiam nobis sanctus episcopus memoriam Aggari uel totius familiae ipsius ualde pulchra, sed facta more antiquo. Duxit etiam nos et ad illum palatium superiorem, quod habuerat primitus rex Aggarus, et si qua praeterea loca erant, monstrauit nobis. 19. Illud etiam satis mihi grato fuit, ut epistolas ipsas siue Aggari ad Dominum siue Domini ad Aggarum, quas nobis ibi legerat sanctus episcopus, acciperem michi ab ipso sancto. Et licet in patria exemplaria ipsarum haberem, tamen gratius mihi uisum est, ut et ibi eas de ipso acciperem, ne quid forsitan minus ad nos in patria peruenisset; nam uere amplius est, quod hic accepi. Unde si Deus noster Iesus iusserit et uenero in patria, legitis uos, dominae animae meae.

If we examine more closely the use of the demonstratives in this passage, we find (apart from the use of *ipse* for *is*, e.g., 6 *filii ipsius;* 11 *contra ipso loco ubi*) that common nouns, when first introduced, appear without it, but, when mentioned again, are accompanied by *ipse* or *idem*: 4 *in eadem ciuitatem*, 7 *ipsa ciuitas* appear after Edessa has been men-

tioned; 8 *ipsa aqua,* 11 *ipsam aquam* after the mention of *aquam;* 16 *ad portam ipsam,* 17 *per ipsam portam* [thrice!] after 16 *ad portam, per quam ingressus est Ananias cursor.* The case of 8 *ipsa epistola* (*sicut scriptum est in ipsa epistola*) is basically the same as *ipsa aqua, ipsa porta,* since it appears after the statement *posteaquam . . . Dominus rescripserat Aggaro,* in which the verb *(re)scribere* implies a letter; *rescripserat* itself may be taken as the antecedent of *epistola.* The pronoun *ipse* (or *idem*) seems then to have the meaning ("the same">) "the aforementioned" and represents a device of recapitulation; proper nouns are in general above recapitulation—*ipse* never appears in our passage with Magnus, Ananias cursor, Persae; only once with Aggarus, 15 *ipse Aggarus* in contraposition to his son Magnus; *(sanctus) episcopus* seems to be on one level with proper names, but once, 17, we find *sanctus ipse.* The question would then arise why such persistent recapitulation (by means of *ipse*) was found necessary by the author (in classical Latin the recapulative *is* may not be found in sequence as we find *ipse* used in this Vulgar Latin text).

It is clear that, in our selection, the focal point is the correspondence between Christ and King Abgar of Edessa; it is the original of these letters which Aetheria came to see and of which she obtains a copy (19) from the bishop, a copy more complete than the one extant in her home convent and which she will personally send back or, God permitting, show to her fellow nuns. This authentic document, above any "philological suspicion," this autograph of the divine writer Himself, this relic of Edessa, is accordingly mentioned eight times in our chapter (and was mentioned before, XVII, 1, as the reason for Aetheria's visit to Edessa), mostly with the addition of *ipsa*—which, then, must have been deliberately used with its full deliberate emphasis; it must still mean "the same," "the very (letter[s])," it must emphatically insist on the identity, the authenticity of the autograph. In this supposedly automatic repetition of the demonstrative we are surely meant to hear an echo of that naive astonishment of the author, surprised that such a precious relic could still be found there, in that city of Edessa where it was sent centuries before by the Lord at the time of His sojourn on earth; and that a pious visitor like herself, Aetheria, should be able to see with her own eyes "the letter itself,"[2] to have it read to her, and to copy it for her fellow nuns. This is the amazement of the pilgrim who finds at the places she visits "the very things" for which those places are famous, the most surprised delight at the concordance of things seen and things heard of (an astonishment which is not yet extinct in the modern secular traveler

[2] We may think of the letter found in the hands of the dead Saint Alexius, which is read with solemn protocol in the OF *Poème de St. Alexis.*

who is still somehow amazed that things he has read about in his Baedeker do actually exist where he was told he would find them) and at the confirmation her faith receives from that concordance. All of this is underlying in the repeated recapitulative *ipse*; and, if the critic fails to hear this particular tone, both of topographic precision and of religious awe, in the sequence of pronouns, he has not grasped their function—which is rather stylistic than grammatical in nature (although such repeated use may ultimately lead toward grammaticization).[3] And the diagnosis would fit the *ipse*'s which accompany other objects of miraculous significance in our selection: the city gates through which the messenger of Christ came ("these very gates which you see here"), the water that emerged by a miracle ("this very water"), the city (*ipsa*) that contains such venerable relics of sacred history, the *sanctus ipse* who is the *cicerone* in this city of wonders. *Ipse*, true to its original meaning, is, in all these examples, anaphoric, not deictic (for the *cicerone*, in pointing to objects, uses, in direct speech, the demonstratives *hic* or *iste*), nor a predecessor of the Romance article (for this can appear not only in recapitulative function but the first time a noun is mentioned, provided it fits into a known framework; already in the *Chanson de Sainte Eulalie* we find *li Deo enemi, al diaule*, etc.). It has no other purpose than to reflect the prolonged emotional earnestness of the narrator bent on identification of legendary happenings. If this *ipse* can be identified with anything Romance, it is with the near-pronoun in Middle French *le dit* (*la dite*) or It. *la ditta* [*casa*], etc.—that is, with those *ipse, idem, ille* pronouns which occur in the late Ro-

[3] My interpretation is different from that of H. F. Muller, *L'Epoque mérovingienne*, p. 153: "Silvia ou Aetheria use d'une façon exagérée des démonstratifs comme les gens qui ne savent s'exprimer ont recours d'une manière abusive aux gestes et aux grimaces, surtout lorsqu'ils se débattent avec les descriptions de lieux et d'incidents." Here we would have, then, in opposition to Terracini's conception of Aetheria as a frail womanly personality impressing herself delicately on her language, a crude, uncultured, grimacing woman! *Difficile est satiram non scribere.* But Muller—though he uses the statistics of his pupil G. L. Trager who stated that in the *Peregrinatio* we find 166 cases of *ipse* vs. 106 of *ille*, while in Caesarius of Arles there were on the contrary 113 cases of *ille* vs. 40 of *ipse*—does not explain the preponderance of *ipse* in the *Peregrinatio*. I believe I have offered a reason for this preponderance—the genre of the account of a pilgrimage in which the identification is paramount. Caesarius or Arles, on the other hand, writes sermons in which such identifications are of secondary importance. As for the theory of M. Muller on the relationship between the increase in demonstratives in Vulgar Latin (and the ultimate development of the article in Romance) and the Christian civilization in which things are subjected to man (the demonstrative pronoun is, according to Muller, the linguistic equivalent of the gesture that points toward objects and, thereby, dominates them!), I can only express my scepticism. What is Christian in the increase of demonstratives in Vulgar Latin is perhaps (but I would propose this view only with caution) the insistent didacticism of this religion whose nature it is to enforce its teachings in everyday life and which found ample opportunity to point to details as significant.

man (and again in the Middle French, Middle Italian, etc.) chancery style in alternation with *praefatus, antefatus, suprascriptus (-dictus), antenominatus, (supra)memoratus,* and which have received excellent treatment by Dag Norberg, *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax* (Upsala, 1944), pp. 70 seq. Norberg quotes from the letters of Gregory the Great: "*monasterii sanctorum Andreae et Thomae . . . monasterii* ipsius . . . ejusdem *monasterii* . . . eidem *monasterio* . . . *monasterium* illud"; "*ecclesiam sancti Pancratii* . . . eidem *ecclesiae* . . . antefatae *ecclesiae* . . . praefatae *ecclesiae* . . . *in* suprascripta *ecclesia* . . . *ecclesia* ipsa . . ." If we say that Gregory's use of recapitulative modifiers is "legalistic," we would not be far wrong in attributing the same nuance to his near-contemporary, Aetheria; she is surely "legalistic" in the precision with which she attempts to identify relics and places.

To the repeated usage of *ipse* in the written narrative of the pilgrim corresponds the repetition of *hic* or *hic (iste) . . . quem uides* in the speech of the bishop: 11 "Nam monticulum *istum, quem uides, filia,* super ciuitate hac, in illo tempore ipse *huic* ciuitati aquam ministrabat." 12 " In ea ergo die . . . statim *hii* fontes, *quos uides in eo loco,* iusso Dei a semel eruperunt: ex ea dis *hi* fontes usque in hodie permanent *hic* gratia Dei . . ." 13 "Nam et postmodum quotienscumque uoluerunt . . . expugnare *hanc* ciuitatem hostes, *haec* epistola prolata est . . ." 14 "Illud etiam retulit sanctus episcopus eo quod *hii* fontes ubi erup[ei]-erunt . . ." 15 "ita tamen ut *hii* fontes intra palatium includerentur"—here the *hii* is found in indirect discourse, but this is only a paraphrase of direct speech as is shown by the direct speech that reappears in 15. The spoken *iste, hic (quem uides)* is, like the "written" *ipse,* inspired by pious astonishment, this time astonishment on the part of the cicerone, who is full of wonder before the visible things which contain such portentous indications of transcendent happenings and which he is able to point out to Aetheria as *hoc quod uides.* The same insistence on concrete evidence "within the reach of your eyes" is repeated in his speech: 15 ". . . filio suo Magno, id est *isti, cuius* archiotipa *uides* iuxta patre posita," and particularly the continuity of existence in time of the spring that emerged by miracle is stressed repetitiously: 12 "*ex ea die hi fontes* usque in hodie permanent hic gratia Dei . . . *sicut tamen* et usque in hodie apparet: *nam postea nunquam nec qualiscumque humor* ibi apparuit usque in hodie . . ." 14 ". . . *Quod palatium Aggari quasi in editiori loco positum erat,* sicut et nunc paret, ut uides." 17 ". . . *ex ea die* . . . usque in praesentem diem custodiatur."[4]

A feature of style which seems to me connected with the recapitu-

[4] The same concern with the preservation of remembrances of a legendary past

lative pronouns (*ipse, hii quos uides*) is the repetition of the correlative noun in the relative clause (in our selection, XIX, 6, "ad palatium Aggari regis . . . in *cuius Aggari* uultu"; cf. IV, 6, "ubi est rubus; *qui rubus* . . ."). Löfstedt (p. 81), who finds the same feature in other Latin works of all periods written in a more colloquial style, considers this a popular device and quite independent of the same use in legalistic sources. But relative clauses seem nowhere to belong to the genuine popular style; our type of repetition can then, at best, be only a relatively popular feature within a mainly written language, emanating from a popular writer who, when transposing her spoken language into written style, tries to be more learned. Löfstedt knows only the alternative "written-spoken," but anyone who has read popular correspondence (for example, of prisoners of war) or who remembers the strange hyperurbanisms[5] in the speech of lower officials (what André Thérive has called for France *le parler gendarme*) knows the *tertium quid*, the imitation of literary style by popular writers. When we find legalistic devices which coincide with those of popular style, there is at least a

---

will be found in Old French secular legends—for example, in the beginning of Marie de France's Lai *Les dous amanz*:

> Jadis avint en Normandie
> une aventure molt oïe
> de dous enfanz ki s'entramerent
> par amur ambedui finerent
> . . . Veritez est qu'en Nëustrie,
> que nus apelum Normendie,
> a un halt munt merveilles grant:
> la gisent li dui enfant.
> Pres de cel munt a une part
> par grant conseil e par esguart
> une cité fist faire uns reis
> ki esteit sire des Pistreis;
> de ses Pistreins la fist numer
> e Pistre la fit apeler.
> Tuz jurs a puis duré li nuns;
> uncore i a vile e maisuns.
> Nus savum bien de la cuntree
> qui li vals de Pistre est nomee.

This heavily repetitious insistence on localization serves as a pseudo-archaeological background for the legendary story of the young couple who die for love and are buried on the mountain.

[5] Karl Meister has shown the existence of hyperurbanisms in the *Peregrinatio*, for example *ingressus est discipulis* (instead of *ad discipulos)*; cf. Löfstedt, p. 10. I agree, of course, with critics such as Meister who, in contrast to Usener's earlier opinion about Aetheria's use of the "unverbildetes Vulgärlatein ihrer Heimat," emphasize the stylized, written ("gebildet"!) quality of Aetheria's prose, which was perhaps as remote from the daily usage of Latin in her time as was Cicero's language from daily usage in his time; cf. Van Oorde, *Lexicon Aetherianum*, p. 14; cf. also Terracini, *loc. cit*, p. 13: "En ella lo literario deja ordinariamente de ser literario, así como lo vulgar ya no es vulgar."

possibility that the legalistic devices have been adopted by the populace, just in order to give the popular speaker opportunity to appear "legalistic." May not the popular writer Aetheria, who uses the type of expression . . . *qui rubus*, be attempting to appear "legalistic," precise, even pedantic when she uses everywhere the recapitulative style? Somewhat similarly, the enumerative *nec non etiam*, treated by Löfstedt, p. 95, as a device both poetic and popular, is surely basically a self-conscious literary device of the popular writer Aetheria—I cannot imagine that *nec non etiam=et* was *spoken* at her time!

The attitude of "awe and precision" (awe for the wondrous content of the account, precision of visible detail that substantiates the account) informs obviously the whole hieratic slowness of the *Peregrinatio*—its word repetitions produce a static effect of "rest in awe." It is indeed not the demonstratives alone that are repeated (cf. also the repetition of *is*: 12 *in ea ergo die et in ea hora . . . ex ea die . . . in ea hora*). All significant details of the account reappear more than once—the expression *per ipsam portam* as such, thrice repeated in 17, belongs here. The bishop guides Aetheria to the statue (*archiotepam*) of Abgar (6); *in cuius Aggari uultu* is a repetition of that first statement; then he announces to her, *Ecce rex Aggarus*; and in 15 the statue of Magnus, Abgar's son, to which she was led in 6, is again laboriously explained as *isti cuius archiotipa uides iuxta patre posita*. If the reader will examine again the passage quoted above, he will in nearly every sentence meet with such repetitions. We may only point out the slowing-down effect which this device has on the sentence structure: 9 ". . . ad subito tantae *tenebrae factae* sunt, foras ciuitatem tamen ante oculos Persarum, cum iam prope plicarent ciuitati, ita ut *usque tertium miliarium* de ciuitate essent: sed ita mox *tenebris turbati* sunt, ut uix castra ponerent et pergirarent *in miliario tertio* totam ciuitatem." 10 "Ita autem *turbati* sunt Persae, ut numquam uiderent postea, qua parte in ciuitate ingrederentur, sed custodirent ciuitatem per giro clusam hostibus *in miliario tertio* . . ." Certain ever-recurring sentence fragments are stationed throughout the period like reminiscent milestones and seem to obstruct the straight way; a classical writer would have summed up the beginning of 9 much more briefly: ". . . tantis tenebris oculi Persarum stantium ad tertium miliarium de ciuitate turbati sunt ut ingressum reperire non possent et castra in eo intervallo ponere coacti essent."[5a] The blocks on the road of the sentence are all destined to

[5a] We may remember that the classical "Auctor ad Herennium" (I, 9, 14) indicts the following verses because of the repetitions they contain:

> Athenis *Megaram* uesperi *aduenit* Simo:
> Vbi *aduenit Megaram*, *insidias fecit* uirgini:
> *Insidias* postquam *fecit*, uim in loco adtulit.

detain the pious reader—a second pilgrim as it were—and to fix his attention on particular stations (the painted fourteen stations of the *via crucis* are only another illustration of that basic tendency of presenting sacred history in cyclic form). This is already *in nuce* the well-known poetic technique of successive darting movements in the Old French *Chanson de geste* with its *laisses répétitives* and *recommencements*[6] (and it may also remind us of the sculptural technique manifesting itself on the Hildesheim portals, where the scene of the temptation of Adam by Eve is broken down into a sequence of stages). Here, then, the Vulgar Latin pattern of narrative foreshadows exactly the Romance epic pattern. The didactic hammering on the significant details of the action, in the *Peregrinatio* as well as in the *Chanson de geste*, takes precedence over the even development of the narrative, to which antiquity has accustomed us. The hieratic repose created by such a procedure roots, obviously, in the belief of the narrator in the significance, inner consistency, and preordained direction of the action, which he would have linger in the mind of the reader. This literary technique reflects the new Christian technique of life, which enjoins the believer to keep before his eyes, at any moment and in any situation, the significance of life under the New Dispensation. (We sometimes cannot help feeling, however, that the slow motion of such a style is equivalent to what the French call "piétiner sur place.")

Thus, the repetition of the pronouns must be inserted into the over-all pattern of repetition, which is intended to cement the inner coherence of the sentences by emphasizing the "sameness" of the things and persons presented and to rivet, according to the spirit of the pilgrimage, the legendary happenings to the locality before the eyes of the pilgrim; . . . *ostendebantur iuxta scripturas*, the fragmentary words with which our text begins, is a statement which overshadows the whole *Peregrinatio*—and much of mediaeval literature that is "recapitulative" in essence.

If we look beyond the selection quoted at the beginning of this study, we shall see the same repetitive features reappear. Here are a number of examples:

I, 1. [The approach to Mount Sinai] . . . peruenimus ad quendam locum, ubi se[x] tamen montes illi, inter quos ibamus, aperiebant et faciebant uallem infinitam ingens, planissima et ualde pulchram, et trans uallem apparebat mons sanctus Dei Syna. Hic autem locus, ubi se montes aperiebant . . . 2. In eo ergo loco . . .

[6] G. Paris, *La Littérature française au moyen âge*, p. 62: "On peut dire que la *Chanson de Roland* (ainsi que toutes nos plus anciennes chansons de geste) se développe, non pas, comme les poèmes homériques, par un courant large et ininterrompu, non pas, comme le *Nibelungenlied*, par des battements d'ailes égaux et lents, mais par une suite d'explosions successives, toujours arrêtées court et toujours reprenant avec soudaineté."

Habebat autem de eo loco ad montem Dei forsitan quattuor milia totum per ualle illa, quam dixi ingens.

II, 1. Vallis autem ipsa ingens est ualde . . . Ipsam ergo uallem nos trauersare habebamus . . . 2. Haec est autem uallis ingens et planissima, in qua filii Israhel commorati sunt . . . Haec est autem uallis, in qua factus est uitulus, qui locus usque in hodie ostenditur; nam lapis grandis ibi fixus stat in ipso loco. Haec ergo uallis ipsa est, in cuius capite ille locus est, ubi sanctus Moyses . . .
5. [Mount Sinai, which had twice been called in the preceding, *Mons Dei*] Mons autem ipse per giro quidem unus esse uidetur; intus autem quod ingrederis, plures sunt, sed totum mons Dei appellatur, specialis autem ille, in cuius summitate est hic locus, ubi descendit maiestas Dei, sicut scriptum est, in medio illorum omnium est. 6. Et cum hi omnes, qui per girum sunt, tam excelsi sint . . . tamen ipse ille medianus,[7] in quo descendit maiestas Dei, tanto altior est omnibus illis, ut cum subissemus in illo, prorsus toti illi montes, quo excelsos uideramus, ita infra nos essent ac si colliculi permodici essent. 7. Illud sane satis admirabile est et sine Dei gratia puto illud non esse, ut cum omnibus altior sit ille medianus, qui specialis Syna dicitur, id est in quo descendit maiestas Domini, tamen uideri non possit . . .

III, 1. . . . donec peruenias ad radicem propriam illius mediani, qui est specialis Syna. 2. . . . peruenimus in summitatem illam montis Dei sancti Syna . . . ubi descendit maiestas Domini in ea die, qua mons fumigabat. 6. . . . Nam cum ipse mons sanctus Syna totus petrinus sit . . . tamen deorsum prope radicem montium ipsorum, id est seu circa illius qui medianus est seu circa illorum qui per giro sunt, modica terrola est . . . 8. Illud autem uos uolo scire, dominae uenerabiles sorores, quia de eo loco ubi stabamus, id est in giro parietes ecclesiae, id est de summitate montis ipsius mediani, ita infra nos uidebantur esse illi montes . . . iuxta istum medianum . . . ac si essent illi colliculi . . .

In this passage, the author herself explains to us, as it were, the reason for her recapitulation—that Mount Sinai, the innermost elevation in a group of mountains, though the highest, cannot be seen from far. This appears to Aetheria, and to the monks who had prepared her for the spectacle, as a miracle wrought by the grace of God, and it is in this light that she wishes to present the fact to her fellow nuns. Consciousness of a miracle is present, then, throughout the description, in which the author dwells thrice on the topographic fact in question and in which a repetition of such crystallized expressions as *ille medianus, specialis,*

[7] Notice here that *specialis autem ille* [*mons*] *qui* is repeated in II, 6 in the form *ipse ille medianus, in quo*—which fact clearly shows *ipse* to be recapitulative, while *ille in quo* has the defining function; *ipse*, then, means again "the very, the same." Trager in his thesis *The Use of the Latin Demonstrative* (New York, 1932), p. 153, quotes a similar case from Caesarius of Arles in a passage where this writer explains the origin of Christ the Son in God the Father: "Quod cum lampade ad lampadem transferatur, licet duae lampades ardeant, tamen *ille ignis ipse* est utique in secunda, qui splendebat in prima." Trager comments correctly: "The presence of both *ille* and *ipse* shows immediately that one of them is used not as a demonstrative, but as what we have been calling the syntactic accent, for *ipse* itself would mean 'that very,' 'that . . . itself.'" Notice that *ipse ille* has survived in Romance: OF *en es l'eure*, It. *lunghesso la strada*, Rumanian *(cun)insul* and that according to Tilander, *Studia neophil.*, IX, 294, an *ipse is* (attested in the *Peregrinatio*: *et ipsis exponitur eis)* is preserved in Catal. *eix*, Prov. *eis*.

ubi descendit maiestas Dei (*Domini*) is to be noted.[8] Again, there is mention of the harmony that exists between the report of the Scriptures,

[8] This rambling, or stammering, description (which, when I first read it twenty-five years ago, made upon me, who at that time did not understand the reasons for the repetitions, an impression of utter auctorial helplessness) may be compared with a short description of Caesar's (*De bello gallico*, II 18), chosen at random (and here I cannot claim to have been impressed by the particular passage at the time of my reading of *De bello gallico* in college, because *all* of Caesar's style seemed to me to possess the same qualities): "Loci natura erat haec, quem locum nostri castris delegerant. Collis ab summo aequaliter declivis ad flumen Sabim, quod supra nominavimus, vergebat. Ab eo flumine pari acclivitate collis nascebatur, adversus huic et contrarius, passus circiter ducentos, infimus apertus, ab superiore parte silvestris, ut non facile introrsus perspici posset. Inter eas silvas hostes in occulto sese continebant: in aperto loco secundum flumen paucae stationes equitum videbantur. Fluminis erat altitudo pedum circiter trium." This classical description, factually conceived from the strategic angle of a general, is well-balanced, clear, straightforward, and concise. Notice the stylistic system of the homologies in the description of the two hills facing each other, stylistic homologies made to correspond exactly to those of the terrain: *aequaliter declivis—pari acclivitate vergebat; nascebatur, ab summo . . . ad flumen—infimus . . . ab superiore parte.* Note also the contrast of the two sentences containing *declivis* and *acclivitas*; the first implies downward movement of the eye, the second upward movement, both corresponding to the viewpoint of the Romans, which is firmly established throughout the passage: "*ut non facile introrsus* perspici posset [could not easily be inspected], *videbantur* [could be seen]." The two movements of the eye are further indicated by the phrase (*collis*) *adversus huic et contrarius*, the only case in our passage in which two synonyms are coupled; *adversus huic* is said from the prevailing subjective point of view of the Romans who saw the other hill turned toward them ("toward this our hill"), *contrarius* from the objective point of view ("opposite"). The distance between the two hills (and consequently between the two armies) is marked by the phrase *passus circiter ducentos*, which is placed symbolically in the exact middle of the paragraph. This paragraph opens and closes with shorter sentences which serve to delimit its confines. There could not be imagined greater economy in word material; no repetitions occur, only delicate reminders of what has been said before—or recapitulations used only in order to assure the *suavitas*, the even flow of the description: *quem locum nostri castris delegerant* (with the type of repetition *qui rubus* occurring only once); this sentence fragment repeats the *deligere* of a previous paragraph to which *flumen Sabim, quod supra nominavimus* also refers: *ab eo flumine inter eas silvas* following up *silvestris; in aperto loco secundum flumen* recapitulating *infimus apertus*. The separation of the description of the landscape proper (*natura loci*) from the mention of human intervention is absolute—the latter being referred to only in the second part (the expressions *non perspici possent, videbantur* suggest *possible* human intervention). The temporal perspective is clear; after the embankment had been chosen by Caesar's soldiers, the description of the landscape develops in the imperfect, which makes us, so to speak, wait for the military action which will ensue in the next paragraph; and similarly, every detail mentioned is chosen in view of the course the imminent battle will take. The element of dramatic tension is wisely calculated; at the end of the paragraph the stage is set for the battle to be decribed in the next paragraph.

Caesar's is truly not only a strategist's, but a "strategic" style (strategic insofar as it guides the eye of the reader), obviously reflecting only human, not any superhuman, intervention. On the contrary, in Aetheria's description it seems as though the "majesty of God," descending on nature, had broken up the perspective into fragments (so that the simple fact, known to any tourist, that a high mountain, emerging among hills, dwarfs them, must be presented as a "miracle" that makes the spectator speechless).

the account of the local guides, and the actual picture before the eyes of the pilgrim. It should be noted also that, precisely because the whole of the Biblical account is present to the mind of the writer and to that of her audience, Aetheria does not feel obliged to include all the details the first time she reports on Mount Sinai. New facts continue to appear in subsequent recapitulations; for example, the detail *in ea die qua mons fumigabat* is new in the context (although somehow implied in the previously mentioned *descendit maiestas dei*). I mention this here because it may explain the new (even sometimes contradictory) details that are furnished in repetitive *laisses* in Old French epic poems; one must assume in this case, as in the *Peregrinatio*, that the whole picture of the significant situations is supposed by the poet to be present to his audience. Therefore he does not feel the need of creating from nothing the full picture at one stroke; instead, he is free, as it were, to remind his public now of this detail, now of that, which he feels to be of particular interest. It might be argued, however, that, for example in the case of the *Chanson de Roland*, no such common picture (before the legend of Roland had crystallized in the poem itself) may have existed for author and public—so that we must assume a transfer to secular poetry of a technique which was absolutely valid in reference to Biblical matters. If this supposition is correct, the *Peregrinatio* offers us the Old French epic technique *in statu nascendi*.

Another point to be made about Aetheria's description is her tendency to combine in her new details information supplied by her guides and to present this information according to the importance, not of the historical facts themselves, but of the speakers—which entails the disregard of the logical relationships of the facts. In VIII, 1 seq., Aetheria describes a field of ruins, the ruins of what was once the city of Ramesse in which remain intact only two colossal statues—"they say (*dicunt*) that they are statues of Moses and Aaron"—and an old but still fruit-bearing sycomore—"they say (*dicitur*) that it has been planted by the Patriarchs." Next we are told the Greek name of the tree (*dendros alethiae=arbor ueritatis*), which information is given to Aetheria by a "holy bishop of Arabia" who, in her words, was kind enough to meet her and tell her "de illas statuas quas dixi, ut etiam de illa arbore sicomori." Later the same bishop informs her that it was Pharaoh who, on his expedition against the emigrating Jews, burned Ramesse. Thus this last, all-important fact about Ramesse comes out only in a third retouching of the picture. She must group the information in an ascending order from anonymous report (*dicunt, dicitur*) to the authoritative explanations of the learned bishop—but in so doing she inevitably becomes repetitious ("de illas statuas *quas dixit* et *etiam* de illa arbore sicomori").

Sometimes the factual details of an event appear piecemeal because the author must stress her emotion repeatedly:

XX, 5. . . . *Hoc autem nobis satis* gratum euenit, ut pridie martyrium die ibi ueniremus . . . ad quam diem necesse fuit undique et de omnibus Mesopotamiae finibus omnes monachos in Charra descendere, etiam et illos maiores, qui in solitudine sedebant, quos ascites uocant . . . 6. *Itaque ergo hoc nobis ultra spem grate satis euenit,* ut sanctos et uere homines Dei monachos Mesopotamenos ibi uideremus, etiam et eos, quorum fama uel uita longe audiebatur, quos tamen non aestimabam me penitus posse uidere . . . quia audieram eos, eo quod extra diem Paschae et extra diem hanc non eos descendere de locis suis, quoniam tales sunt, ut et uirtutes faciant multas . . . Itaque Deo iubente sic euenit, ut ad diem, quem nec sperabam, ibi uenirem.

This is a typical *laisse répétitive,* foreshadowing Old French epics: in "*laisse* 1" (beginning with "Hoc autem nobis . . .") we hear that the saintly men of Mesopotamia called "ascetes" are in the habit of coming to Carrhae on the day of the patron Saint Elipidius; in "*laisse* 2" ("Itaque ergo hoc nobis . . .") we learn that the ascetes (of whom new information is given to us—they are world-famous, they work miracles) come to Carrhae only on Saint Elpidius' day and at Easter time.

And now I shall transcribe, with more cursory treatment, several descriptions of Biblical places:

THE BURNING BUSH: IV, 6. . . . ad caput ipsius uallis exire nos necesse erat, quoniam ibi erant monasteria . . . et ecclesia in eo loco, ubi est rubus; qui rubus usque in hodie uiuet et mittet uirgultas. 7. Ac sic ergo perdescenso monte Dei peruenimus ad rubum hora forsitan decima. Hic est autem rubus, quem superius dixi, de quo locutus est Dominus Moysi in igne, qui est in eo loco, ubi monasteria sunt plurima et ecclesia in capite uallis ipsius. Ante ipsam autem ecclesiam hortus est gratissimus habens aquam optimam abundantem, in quo horto ipse rubus est. 8. Locus etiam ostenditur ibi iuxta, ubi stetit sanctus Moyses, quando ei dixit Deus: "Solue corrigam calciamenti tui" et cetera . . . facta est oratio in ecclesia nec non etiam et in horto ad rubum, lectus est etiam locus ipse de libro Moysi iuxta consuetudinem: et sic, quia sera erat, gustauimus nobis loco in horto ante rubum cum sanctis ipsis: ac sic ergo fecimus ibi mansionem . . . V, 2. Nam in primo capite ipsius uallis, ubi manseramus et uideramus rubum illum, de quo locutus est Deus sancto Moysi in igne, uideramus etiam et illum locum, in quo steterat ante rubum sanctus Moyses, quando ei dixit Deus: "Solue corrigiam calciamenti tui; locus enim, in quo stas, terra sancta est." 3. Ac sic ergo cetera loca, quemadmodum profecti sumus de rubo, semper nobis ceperunt ostendere . . .

The *rubus* in its exact location is here the center of attention; all other details (the church, the garden, etc.) are being seen in relationship with it and the mention of them entails, each time, mention of the *rubus.* The necessity of checking the holy places against the Biblical account—even to the extent of quoting textually the relevant passage from the Scriptures (IV, 8), as is the custom of the pilgrim—has engendered with Aetheria a peculiar "circular" mode of expression (if *a* is connected with

b, *b* must also be connected with *a*): *ibi erant monasteria . . . et ecclesia in eo loco, ubi est rubus* ~ *hic est autem rubus, . . . qui est in eo loco, ubi monasteria sunt . . . et ecclesia.* The eye of the pilgrim wanders incessantly from the Biblical *locus* (i.e., passage) to the *locus* (locality) in Palestine.[9]

ABRAHAM'S HOUSE AT CARRHAE: XX, 1. Nam in scripturis sanctis dicta est Charra, ubi moratus est sanctus Abraam, sicut scriptum est in Genesi . . . 3. Nam duxit nos [the bishop] statim ad ecclesiam, quae est foras ciuitatem in eo loco, ubi fuit domus sancti Abrahae, id est in ipsis fundamentis et de ipso lapide, ut tamen dicebat sanctus episcopus [circular word-arrangement; *ipse*=the very same] . . . 5. Nam ecclesia quam dixi foras ciuitatem, dominae sorores uenerabiles, ubi fuit primitus domus Abrahae, nunc et martyrium ibi positum est . . . [the monks came from everywhere] propter memoriam sancti Abrahae, quia domus ipsius fuit, ubi nunc ecclesia est, in qua positum est corpus ipsius sancti martyris [ecclesia . . . ubi fuit domus Abrahae ~ domus ipsius fuit ubi nunc ecclesia est: circular movement] . . . 8. Nam sicut nos cum grandi reuerentia attendimus locum illum, ubi primitus domus sancti Abrahae fuit, pro memoria illius . . .

THE RETURN TO THE RED SEA: VI, 3. In eo ergo loco de inter montes exiuimus redeuntes, in quo loco et euntes inter montes intraueramus, ac sic ergo denuo plicauimus nos ad mare. Filii etiam Israhel reuertentes ad montem Dei Syna usque ad eum locum reuersi sunt per iter quod ierant, id est usque ad eum locum, ubi de inter montes exiuimus et iunximus nos denuo ad mare rubrum et inde nos iam iter nostrum, quo ueneramus, reuersi sumus: filii autem Israhel de eodem loco, sicut scriptum est in libris sancti Moysi, ambulauerunt iter suum. 4. Nos autem eodem itinere et eisdem mansionibus, quibus ieramus, reuersi sumus in Clesma.

So many ostensibly superfluous repetitions in such a comparatively simple statement as "We took the same way as did the Jews when, at Mount Sinai, they turned away from the road to the Red Sea" are strange to a modern reader; they are to be explained by the necessity felt by Aetheria of proving the identity of her itinerary and that of the Jews by using identical wording to describe the two cases. The *id est*, so frequently used in the *Peregrinatio* (cf. Van Oorde's *Dictionarium Aetherianum*, s. v. *is*), another "unbearable" feature according to Wölfflin,[9a] is the bridge between the two sets of circumstances, and this very *id est* symbolizes indeed the program of a pilgrimage: the identification of the topography of the Bible with the stations of the pilgrim's itinerary. Again, Aetheria's verb *ostendere*, with which her account opens and which is so often repeated, is laden with particular emphasis, since it means "to point out a holy place and establish its identity." We are not surprised to find it (together with its synonym *monstrare*) repeated fourteen times in V, 3-9, in a lengthy enumeration of sights glimpsed

[9] Cf. the circular mode of expression in V, 9, "*Haec est ergo uallis, ubi . . .* [filii Israhel] inmorati sunt, donec fieret tabernaculum et *singula, quae ostensa sunt in montem Dei*," and other examples in note 27.

[9a] But do we not read in the *Vita Nuova*: "elle era uno nove, *cioè* uno miracolo, la cui radice, *cioè* del miracolo, è solamente la mirabile Trinità"? In a world of miracles, whether geographic or allegoric, there is much to explain and the author must state, and restate incessantly, that he is explaining.

from the top of the Sinai—which may remind us of the anaphoric enumerations in Old French epics.[10] At the same time, Aetheria admonishes her fellow nuns who will read her account to compare this carefully with the Scriptures and betrays that her attention is divided between sacred topography and the Palestinian scene: "Ac sic ergo singula, quecumque

[10] Cf. *Ch. de Rol.*, vv. 169 seq.:

Li empereres s'en vait desuz un pin,
Ses baruns mandet pur sun cunseill fenir,
. . . E *si i furent* e Gerers e Gerin;
Ensembl' od els li quens Rolland *i vint*
E Oliver, li proz e li gentilz
. . . Guenes *i vint*, ki la traïson fist . . .

Or Marie de France, *Lanval*, vv. 205 seq.:

N'ot en la vile chevalier
ki du surjur ait grant mestier,
que il ne face a lui venir
e richement e bien servir.
Lanval donout les riches dons,
Lanval aquitout les prisons,
Lanval vesteit les juglëurs,
Lanval feiseit les granz honurs,
Lanval despendeit largement,
Lanval donout e or e argent:
n'i ot estrange ne privé
a qui Lanval n'ëust doné.

Cf. also the passage from the *Guillelme* intended simply to inform us that a battle lasted from Monday to Thursday: "Cele bataille durat tot un lunsdi e al demain e tresqu'a mercresdi, qu'el n'alaschast ne hure ne prist fin jusqu'al juesdi . . ."; Miss Hatcher in her article "Epic Patterns in Old French" (*Word*, II, 22) comments (after R. Glasser, *Studien z. Geschichte des franz. Zeitbegriffs*) "that it was not enough, in Old French, to name the limits of the interval of time elapsing: the days must be mentioned in their succession, so that we can live through this interval, live through the stages of its development." Cf. also *Ch. de Roland*, vv. 402 seq.:

Tant chevalchierent Guenes e Blancandrin
Que l'uns a l'autre la sue feit plevit
. . . *Tant chevalchierent* e veies e chemins
Que en Sarraguce descendent suz un if,

on which Ph. A. Becker, *ZFSL*, LXI, 8, remarks: "Fühlt da nicht an der verzögernden Wiederholung des *Tant chevalchierent*, dass er dem hinterlistigen Anschlag die Zeit zum Ausreifen lassen will?" For a discussion of such "Wortwiederholungen im primitiven Stil" (as Eduard Norden has called them), cf. W. Havers, in *Festschrift Max Deutschbein* (Leipzig, 1936), pp. 5 seq., who, however, under the influence of similar observations made by Westermann on languages of aborigines, insists too much on the "comfort" derived in primitive thinking from the repetition of words and phrase patterns and neglects entirely the hieratic ceremoniousness of earlier magic practice. Becker in his article, "Die Anfänge der romanischen Verskunst" (*ZFSL*, LVI, 280), recognizes as constitutive elements of the Old French epic *laisse* or *tirade*: (1) the older strophic forms, (2) the psalmody (litany-like repetition of melody in the recitations of the Psalms), and (3) the rhymes (*Tiradenreim*) in Latin rhymed prose. It may be suggested that the anaphoric, litany-like repetitions in our text, analogous to the repetitions of melody mentioned by Becker under (2), may have been contributing factors in the later creation of the epic tirade.

scripta sunt in libris sanctis Moysi facta fuisse in eo loco . . . ostensa sunt nobis. Quae quidem omnia singulatim scribere satis fuit, quia nec retineri poterant tanta; sed cum leget affectio uestra libros sanctos Moysi, omnia diligentius peruidet, quae ibi facta sunt." Identification with Aetheria can also take the form of *hic est (ipse) locus;* six times consecutively this phrase is repeated in X, 4-7, on the occasion of the visit to the city of Libias (at which place, incidentally, she pauses characteristically to listen to the reading of the corresponding passage from the Pentateuch). Such repetitions as *hic est locus* or *ostenderunt* give the impression of a litany whose aesthetic principle is that of settling on specific words regardless of the monotony thereby engendered, the prolongation of a pious mood[11] being more important than the (also natural) human tendency toward variation. The same style of liturgical monotony is also found in our text when Aetheria enumerates the sequence of sacred texts that are read in the Easter services at Jerusalem, as if to reproduce the sacred monotony of these readings themselves (XXXVII, 5 [three hours long] "nichil fit nisi leguntur lectiones sic: id est ita legitur . . . legitur"—followed by three other mentions of *legitur* or *leguntur*). Again, such liturgical litanies foreshadow the anaphoric enumerations in Old French epic poems.

There is another stylistic detail which finds its place, I believe, in the same framework and which, as was also the case with *ipse*, has been treated only "grammatically" by Wölfflin and Löfstedt—the (according to them "tiring") repetition of *nam*. Löfstedt (p. 34) speaks of its "anknüpfender, weiterführender Funktion= *δέ* " and quotes as typical the *nam*'s of VII, 4 (which I shall number a, b, c, etc.): " *Nam* [a] et Epauleum ostensum est nobis, de contra tamen, et Magdalum fuimus. *Nam* [b] castrum est ibi nunc habens praepositum cum milite, qui ibi nunc praesidet pro disciplina Romana. *Nam* [c] et nos iuxta consuetudinem deduxerunt inde usque ad aliud castrum, etiam Beelsefon ostensum est nobis . . . *Nam* [d] ipse est campus supra mare rubrum . . . ubi filii Israhel, cum uidissent Egyptios post se uenientes, exclamauerunt" and it continues: "5. Oton etiam ostensum est nobis . . . nec non etiam et Socchoth . . . *nam* [e] hic est locus, ubi accepta est lex

[11] This mood has been commented on with great finesse by Terracini, *loc. cit.*, p. 17: "En todos los pasajes en donde se describe con exactitud prolija[!] el desarrollo de las ceremonias litúrgicas, señalado por el lento ritmo[!] de las horas, es muy frecuente el tipo *se facere*, XXX, 1, 1 *hora septima omnis populus ascendunt . . . et cum* ceperit se facere *hora nona, subitur* [4 other examples] . . . El contexto de estas oraciones . . . hace patente, sin comentario, la situación que estilísticamente se realiza con el énfasis del reflexivo: en la tensión la espera de lo que va a pasar adquiere la evidencia de una persona desconocida." Terracini insists, however, overly much on Aetheria's use of the reflexive *se facere*, which, in my opinion, was at that time already current for *fieri*; it is the hieratic repetition of the same pattern of expression which is most significant in these passages.

paschae. 6. Pithona etiam ciuitas . . . ostensa est . . . *nam* [f] et ipsud nunc Phitona castrum est."

It seems to me that such a pleonastic use of the same causal conjunction has an intrinsic meaning and cannot be a matter of automatic writing.[12] Of the six *nam*'s contained in our passage, four (b, d, e, f) are of the type *nam hic est locus ubi* (or *qui nobis ostensus est*). Here Aetheria is explaining the reason, as it were, for *ostensus est*: "this place was pointed out to me because of its significance [Biblical or military]." That is to say, Aetheria works with the following causal patterns:

I am mentioning this place
This place was pointed out to me } *for* it has significance.

and even, perhaps, with the pattern:

This place existed, *for* it had significance.

If this last postulate should seem overbold to the reader, I may point out a characteristic passage in which precisely the relation "existence—significance" is explicitly established by Aetheria, XVI, 2-4: Aetheria sees a convent founded by a monk in the beautiful valley of Corra—"Tunc ego, ut sum satis curiosa [for this phrase see the end of this article], requirere coepi, quae esset haec uallis, ubi sanctus monachus nunc monasterium sibi fecisset; *non enim putabam hoc sine causa esse*"; and she learns that in this valley, at the time of King Ahab, the prophet Elijah had lived. Here, as it happens, we find no *nam*. But the causal idea is clear; Aetheria is saying to herself: "There must be a reason (*causa*), a significance—for this monastery in truth exists!" This is

[12] Auerbach, commenting in his book *Mimesis*, p. 83, on a passage of Gregory of Tours, takes the same general stand against Löfstedt (and Bonnet) when he shows that *nam* has not yet lost it causal meaning in the passage: "Gravia tunc inter Toronicos cives bella civilia surrexerunt. *Nam* Sicharius . . ."; the sentence beginning with *nam* goes on to tell us that a messenger, sent out by a local clergyman, was set upon and killed—a fact which supposedly has no causal connection with the preceding statement of intestine warfare in Touraine. In the course of the next pages, however, we realize that this murder was to lead to the disorders mentioned in the first sentence, and indeed we are subsequently offered this justification, though it is spread out over the whole passage. Parallel cases can be found in the *Peregrinatio*: XXII, 2, "Sed quoniam de Tharso tertia mansione, id est in Hisauria, est martyrium sanctae Teclae, gratam fuit satis, ut etiam illuc accedere, praesertim cum tam in proximo esset." XXIII, 1-2, "*Nam* proficiscens de Tharso perueni ad quandam ciuitatem . . . que appellatur Ponpeiopolim. Et inde iam ingressa fines Hisauriae mansi in ciuitate, quae appelatur Corico. Ac tertia die perueni ad ciuitatem, quae appellatur Seleucia Hisauriae . . . Et quoniam inde ad sanctam Teclam . . . habebat de ciuitate forsitam mille quingentos passus, malui ergo perexire illuc . . ." The causal relationship expressed by *nam* must be spread over the whole of XXIII, 1-2, in which the stations between Tharsus and the sanctuary of St. Thecla are enumerated with the epic redundance described in note 7 ("I wanted to go to Hisauria to the sanctuary of St. Thecla because of its proximity—*for* this place can be reached [easily] via the stations Ponpeiopolis, Corico, Seleucia").

the reverse of the formula given above ("This place exists, was pointed out to me, is mentioned by me—for it has a signficance") ; it is the inductive stage, which is pre-existent to the normal deductive type ("this place exists, for it has significance"), for which Aetheria regularly uses *nam*.

But there is a second causal relationship, perhaps less self-evident, which may explain the other two *nam*'s (a, c) in our passage (and the greater number of those in our text) in which the causal conjunction appears along with *et* or *etiam*. (See V, 5-7, the passage, already quoted, with the sequel of *ostenderunt*, where this verb is regularly followed or preceded by *etiam*, but appears once with *nam* + *etiam* + *et*: *nam ostenderunt nobis etiam et illum locum*; X, 4, the variation *nam hic est locus . . . 5. hic etiam locus est*; V, 9, ". . . donec fieret tabernaculum et singula, quae ostensa sunt in montem Dei. *Nam* ostensus est nobis *et* ille locus, in quo confixum a Moyse est primitus tabernaculum et perfecta sunt singula, quae iusserat Deus in montem Moysi, ut fierent.") In both of the examples, VII, 4-6, unlike the three just treated, the *nam* introduces, not a statement of significance, but the fact that the place in question was pointed out to Aetheria. Now, in these two cases, there can be no causal connection with the preceding statement; we may, perhaps, supply as the grounds for the *nam*-statement, some such idea as: "There must exist, in the Holy Land, by God's providence, a fixed series of sacred places—for, lo, this place exists (was pointed out to me), that place exists, the other place exists . . ." Surely, the idea of a series is suggested by the *et* (*etiam, etiam et*) which appears so frequently when this use of *nam* occurs.[13] As a result of our discussion of the *nam*= δέ , it should be stated that its expletive use, while in line with general tendencies of Vulgar Latin, is revelatory of the *forma mentis* of the particular writer Aetheria, and that our linguists adopt an anachronistic, modern stylistic ideal when they allow themselves to be "bored" by such a characteristic feature of her style; more-

[13] The same relationship between a sequence or totality and the individual case is frequently found with OF *car*—only, here, the idea is usually in reverse (deductive not inductive) : "this is true for the individual case, *for* it is true of a totality." Cf. in the OF *Passion*:

94 quar e l'enfer dunc a salit [Christ].
95 Et qui [here] era li om primers
e•l soi enffant per son pecchiad
e li petit e li gran
e qui esterent per mulz anz.
96 Quar anc non fo nuls om carnals
en cel enfer non fos anaz
usque vengues qui rens [redeemed] pecat.

"The first man and all of his children went to Hell before Christ liberated mankind by His descent to Hell, *for* it is true of *all* men that they went to Hell before" (cf. my article in *Zeitschr. f. frz. Spr. u. Lit.*, LVIII, 437 seq.).

over, that *nam*, like the types of expression *ipse, hoc quŏd uides, qui rubus*, introduces an atmosphere of consistency and steadiness into her narrative and replaces the classic art of periodizing, which is in general missing in her style.

Since the significance of the places seen by Aetheria, the *id est*, as it were, is alone important, we cannot expect to find nature described for its own sake; formation of terrain interests her only insofar as it can be illuminated by the Scriptures. Wölfflin has rightly stated that Aetheria has more interest in religious services than in *Naturschönheiten* and that her descriptions are relevant only for the theologian.[14] This foreshadows the attitude of the whole Middle Ages toward nature; in that period, nature, as far as it cannot teach religious verities, hardly exists.[15] The total estrangement from nature, to which there is access for the pious soul only through the medium of religious significance, explains in turn the poverty of the vocabulary of Aetheria in her references to nature: a valley will uniformly be called *amenissima*, ruins will be said to be *infinitae* ("indefinite in number"), and a beautiful site will be

[14] Enjoyment of nature as such is not something which Aetheria permits herself lightly. In IV, 8, she arrives at the place of the burning bush at evening, that is, at a time when it is too late for mass. In that situation nothing else is left to her but to stay there over night in expectancy of the morning mass—and meanwhile to enjoy the pleasant evening in the garden with the ecclesiastics as company ("et sic, quia sera erat, gustauimus nobis loco in horto ante rubum cum sanctis ipsis"). Often we are given to understand that a site is beautiful because it has religious significance: XIII, 4, "Ego autem cum uiderem *locum tam gratum*, requisiui, quisnam locus esset ille tam amenus. Tunc dictum est michi: 'Haec est ciuitas regis Melchisedech, quae dicta est ante Salem . . .'" A certain preordained beauty distinguishes the holy places. We moderns call a landscape because of its intrinsic beauty "marvelously beautiful" (*merveilleusement beau, wunderschön*)—but for Aetheria, the location of Mount Sinai is *a true marvel*, willed by God. The phrase *locus amoenus* is a mediaeval *topos*, ultimately derived from Virgil (E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Lit. und lat. Mittelalter*, p. 200). This detail proves Aetheria's training in rhetoric.

[15] The bestiaries and lapidaries of the Middle Ages, supposedly concerned with natural phenomena, are used only to teach man about God. Concern with nature as such was considered reprehensible. In the *Hortus delicarium* of Herrad von Landsperg a hermit falls from the last rung of the mystic ladder that leads toward Heaven because he had let himself be distracted from contemplation of God by "superfluous thoughts" about the flowers of his garden. Augustine's teaching, "noli foras ire, nam in interiore animae habitat veritas," was not such as to encourage interest for "outward" nature. Even Petrarch, when he saw the panorama from Mont Ventoux, felt that he must seek refuge from such distraction by reading Augustine. In mediaeval art, as in ancient art, nature enters only in the form of skeletal design, as a sparse selection of stylized ingredients (the "landscape" in its fullness, the *Stimmung* expressed by nature, is an achievement of the Renaissance, of a period, that is, which combined Christian religious feeling with the pantheistic feeling for nature of the ancients). In mediaeval paintings of the vision of St. John on Patmos, nature is only schematically represented by a tree and a rock; cf. A. Rüstow, *Vereinzelung* (Istanbul, 1948), p. 10. In the same vein, in literary descriptions of nature (in the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Poema del Cid*) only very few and conventional ingredients of landscapes are admitted.

summed up in that typically mediaeval "pattern of idealization" which renounces individual description: "there is no more beautiful spot on earth" or "I never saw anything more beautiful." Compare III, 8, "[colliculi ita infiniti] ut non me putarem aliquando altiores uidisse," IX, 4, "Et quid plura? pulchriorem territorium puto me nusquam uidisse quam est terra Iessen" with OF "onques plus preu n'i out" or ". . . ne forma Nature." Wölfflin tentatively explains Aetheria's poverty of vocabulary in general either by the poverty of the Vulgar Latin of her time or by her personal lack of willingness to use the "copia verborum" which may have been at her disposal. I would accept rather the second than the first explanation; I feel that there is a definite "stylistic will," *Stilwille*, as the Germans say, at work in the *Peregrinatio* behind her sober renunciation of embellishments of style in favor of the straightforward, if laborious, identification of holy places. Such a stylistic tendency is quite opposed, for example, to the rhetorical exuberance of the Latin of the monk Valerius who was to write, somewhat later, his panegyric on the *beatissima sanctimonialis uirgo*.

Given the preponderance of the *id est*-mentality with Aetheria, we may wonder what happens when landmarks shown to her are not in accord with the Biblical account. In this case, legend steps in to give the solution, legend which she considers equal to history, since its veracity is guaranteed by the continuity of tradition. The word "legend" (or an equivalent thereof) is never mentioned, but the concept must be inferred from the use of the opposite term "canonic Scriptures." In XX, 8 we are told that Aetheria visited the graves of Bathuel and Nachor (the father and the grandfather of Rebecca), located about 1,000 feet from the city of Carrhae; on that occasion, a dialogue between Aetheria and the "learned bishop" of that city ensues in which we hear, so to speak, the voices of the Scriptural Text and the Legend respectively: "There is something I should like to ask you."—"Tell me what you wish to know and I shall answer, daughter."—"In the Scriptures, there is no mention of Bathuel and Nachor having come to Carrhae, only of Abraham, of his family and of his messenger (who, in the name of Isaac, asked for the hand of Rebecca)."—"This is true, daughter, the mention of Bathuel and Nachor at Carrhae is not found in the Scriptures [this is, incidentally, only half true; for at least Bathuel is mentioned in Genesis, in the story of the messenger at Carrhae], *sed manifeste postmodum hic transierunt et ipsi; denique et memoriae illorum hic sunt* [at the distance of 1,000 feet from the city]." Evidently the idea underlying the answer of the bishop is that legend deduces from the mention of Rebecca at Carrhae the presence of her relatives there. But the word "manifestly" (*manifeste*) brushes over the inferential character of this detail, and "consequently" (*denique*) changes the logical sequence: "here the graves of

B. and N. are shown > consequently B. and N. must have been here," into the irrational one: "they must have been here > consequently their graves are shown." In another passage, XII, 2, Aetheria sees on Mount Nebo an elevated place of the size of a tomb, and the monks explain to her that this is the place where, according to local tradition (again the noun "tradition" is not mentioned, but it is implied in *traditum a maioribus*), the angels deposited the body of Moses, the location of whose grave, according to the Bible, is unknown to all men: "quoniam certum est eum ab angelis fuisse sepultum. Nam memoria illius, ubi positus sit, in hodie non ostenditur; sicut enim nobis *a maioribus, qui hic manserunt,* (ubi) ostensum est, ita et nos uobis monstramus: qui *et ipsi tamen maiores ita sibi traditum a maioribus suis esse* dicebant." The desire for local identification is here again in evidence, although modern historical criticism in establishing the identification is completely absent. Sometimes a questionable identification is established without the aid of any physical phenomenon that could be interpreted as supporting it. Thus from Mount Nebo the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was turned cannot be seen, and Aetheria makes this clear to her fellow nuns to whom she addresses her report; nevertheless there seems to be no doubt for Aetheria that the exact spot where the pillar stood can be located (XII, 7): "Sed mihi credite, domine uenerabiles, quia columna ipsa iam non paret, locus autem ipse tantum ostenditur: columna autem ipsa dicitur mari mortuo fuisse quooperta. Certe locum cum uideremus, columnam nullam uidimus, et ideo fallere uos super hanc rem non possum." In this situation, in which we feel the pious disappointment of the writer, the Bishop of Segor brings help by adding his information (more authoritative than the "one says," *dicitur*) that it is "already some years" (*iam aliquot anni*) that the pillar has been covered by the sea (he does not say definitely that he in his lifetime has seen the pillar)—and immediately Aetheria states, with apparent conviction, that the precise spot was about six miles from Segor, turning legend into matter-of-fact reality (*stetit*, not *stetisse dicitur*): "Nam de Segor forsitan sexto miliario ipse locus est ubi stetit columna illa, quod nunc totum cooperit aqua." The belief in the identifiability of the holy places is obviously pre-existent to the actual proof of the identification.[16] The same irrational belief seems to characterize the monks who give Aetheria information. In some cases we are told that a topographic identification has come to them as a revelation which has led to archaeological

[16] In Cabrol's *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, s.v. *Etheria*, these sentences are interpreted by Férotin and Leclercq as though, at least in this passage, "la spirituelle pèlerine" manifested "un scepticisme réellement amusant." And, by translating our passage into sceptical French speech ("Croyez-moi, vénérables dames, j'ai eu beau regarder, mais pas la moindre trace de statue . . ."), they add a nuance which seems to me entirely out of place.

discoveries on their part. Thus, in XVI, 6, we learn of a monk who was directed in a vision to dig in a certain spot for the grave of Job—and a tombstone which bore Job's name was indeed found: "Cui Iob ad tunc in eo loco facta est ista ecclesia, quam uidetis, ita tamen ut lapis *cum corpore* non moueretur in alio loco, sed ibi, *ubi inuentum fuerat corpus*, positus esset, et *ut corpus subter altarium iaceret*." Suddenly, in the description of the tomb we had been given, a body also materializes, to our surprise but evidently not to Aetheria's. Is this belated mention of the body due to that narrative device described above, according to which Aetheria feels free to add a basic detail quite incidentally? Or, in this case, does the significant detail of the body emerge, for Aetheria too, in the course of her description—"body" being attracted into the account by "tombstone"?[17]

The discovery of a holy place is indeed for Aetheria a pious action and its description is shrouded in all the solemn formality of a church service, characterized by didactic repetitions of basic motifs. In XIII, 4 Aetheria sees Sedima (Salem), a city situated in a beautiful valley from which emerges a hill in the form of a tombstone; when she asks for the name of the place, she is given the answer: "Haec est ciuitas *regis Melchisedech*, quae dicta est ante Salem . . . Nam in isto colliculo . . . in summitatem ipsius fabricam quam uides ecclesia est, quae ecclesia nunc appellatur greco sermone opu Melchisedech. Nam *hic est locus, ubi optulit Melchisedech hostias Deo puras*." Aetheria alights from her mule, goes up to the church (where she listens to the reading of the corresponding passage of the Pentateuch), then down to the city (XIV, 2). "Cum ergo descendissemus, ait nobis ille sanctus presbyter . . . dignus qui praesit in *hoc loco, ubi sanctus Melchisedech aduenien-*

[17] It is easy enough to dismiss such inventions as *niaiseries* in the fashion of the sophisticated critics Férotin and Leclercq; but they should be recognized as significant in revealing the workings of a popular mythological imagination, which was not yet dead in Aetheria's time. If we are to believe Hippolyte Delehaye in his article "Les légendes hagiographiques," *Revue des questions historiques*, LXXIV (1903), the workings of the popular imagination are primitive and rudimentary: "Le cerveau de la multitude est donc étroit, incapable de porter l'empreinte d'un grand nombre d'idées et même de toute idée complexe, incapable aussi de se livrer à des raisonnements subtils et suivis, tout préparé, au contraire, à recevoir les impressions des sens. Le concept s'efface aisément, l'image est durable; c'est le côté matériel qui attire le peuple, et c'est aux choses sensibles qu'il attache toutes ses pensées et tous ses sentiments. . . . Rien n'est plus intéressant, à ce point de vue, que les relations de pèlerinages à des sanctuaires fameux, et en particulier les voyages en Terre Sainte. Les plus anciens récits des pieux pèlerins ne portent aucune trace des hésitations et des ignorances de nos savants exégètes en matière de topographie, et avec la plus belle assurance ils vous précisent l'endroit où David a composé ses psaumes, le rocher frappé par Moïse, la grotte où se cacha Elie." I am quoting these lines, in which the antiromantic, intellectualistic attitude of the beginning of the twentieth century manifests itself, in order to show how dated they are today, when a master such as Menéndez Pidal has been able to show us the positive, artistic side of popular legendary imagination.

tem sanctum Abraam hostias Deo puras primus optulit: cum ergo descendissemus, ut superius dixi . . . ait nobis ipse sanctus presbyter: 'Ecce ista fundamenta in giro colliculo isto, quae uidetis, *hae sunt de palatio regis Melchisedech.* 3. Nam ecce ista uia, quam uidetis . . . haec est qua uia regressus est *sanctus Abraam* . . . qua ei *occurrit sanctus Melchisedech rex Salem.*'" We have here, in fact, two repetitive *laisses*, two speeches affirming the same localization, with six mentions of King Melchisedech, three of Abraham, and three of the burnt offerings presented by him (and, of course, the recapitulations of the type *hic est locus, ista uia quam uidetis, cum ergo descendissemus*). In her re-enactment of the scene, Aetheria would din into our ears the authoritative Biblical names and phrases as often as possible. In this connection we may again point to our initial passage (XIX, 16) where, standing before the door through which Christ's messenger came, the bishop reads to Aetheria the correspondence between the Lord and King Abgar: "stans episcopus fecit orationem et legit nobis ibi ipsas epistolas et denuo bendicens nos facta est iterato oratio." This improvised service re-enacts the miracle—Christ's letter being the link between the past and present—and the ceremony, centering in the exhibition of the letter (which, whenever displayed, had worked miraculously), is described with that same slow solemnity with which the church services in Jerusalem will later be described in the second part of the book. Notice the *stans* of our passage, suggestive of solemnity and composure, which recurs in the second part: XXIV, 6, "et sic dicet episcopus *stans* benedictionem"; cf. also XXIV, 5, "lebat se episcopus et *stat* ante cancellum."

Just as within each of such scenes we found the devices of hieratic repetition and the slowing down of the action which is the consequence of repetition, so the whole book shows the holy monotony of scenes mostly of the same type, told with the same words; generally when Aetheria comes to a new place, she asks its name of the ever-ready holy guides who gladly, in that stereotyped form of dialogue over and over repeated, comply with her request and inform her also of the significance of the place according to the Scriptures, which are read to her at each place (*iuxta consuetudinem*); she shows herself grateful for the knowledge acquired, extols the sanctity and amiability of the men who have spent so much time and effort to give her, the undeserving Christian, invaluable information, and assures her fellow nuns of the veracity of what she has learned; and finally she moves on to new places, following the suggestion of her *ciceroni* (*sicut et factum est*). The stereotyped character of such scenes is obviously in harmony with the atmosphere of static, saintly majesty which pervades the whole work. The pilgrimage has its own hieratic decorum. The pilgrim herself is a distinguished person encompassed by her own dignity. All critics have emphasized the

high social standing of the lady who undertook this pilgrimage, protected by the highest local authorities in the various places she visits. But there is an atmosphere around the protagonist of the *Peregrinatio* which cannot be due to social rank alone; the very fact that the same formulations recur again and again (with the same words describing the recurring formalities) shows us a personality poised in the consciousness that religion entails form and gives form to the person of the believer. "Forms are food for religion," said Cardinal Newman. And the formal services which develop in time attempt to give form to time. The "litanies" empty, as it were, the clock time of its everyday content and fill it with one simple but grandiose idea whose repetitions or variations take the place of the minutes and seconds (conversely, in popular thinking litanies become measurements of time—Span. *en un credo*, Ital. *in un avemmaria*, etc.). It is for this reason that to the believer a litany cannot be tedious. The repetitions of stereotyped words represent an organization of time, a victory of religious form over natural anarchy—with every repetition this victory is more strongly enforced. We may think that in the early times of Christianity this continuous victory over anarchy and barbarism was much more of a feat than it is today—and the consciousness of being triumphant gave greater elation to the believing and practicing Christian.

The form of the *Peregrinatio* thus corresponds to its literary intention —to offer an account, written for purposes of edification, of an exemplary feat, extraordinary in Aetheria's time. It is my distinct feeling that our work is primarily not autobiographical, but an idealized account of an ideal pilgrimage; one may notice that, whenever Aetheria indulges in a strictly personal recollection, for example the meeting with an old friend, the deaconess Marthana (XXIII, 3), or in too lavish a description (XX, 10), she is apt to call herself back to her duty by a *sed ut redeam ad rem*. In other words, the "I" that describes this personal itinerary is the "didactic I," which was a general concept of the Middle Ages (cf. my article in *Traditio*, V); and the *Peregrinatio* is neither an impersonal Baedeker[18] nor an *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem* (which

[18] This may be seen from a comparison of our text with, for example, the fourth-century *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, in which the holy places are simply listed, without forming any part of the "story" of the personal experiences of the narrator: "*Est ibi* et crepta, *ubi* Salomon daemones torquebat. *Ibi est* angulus turris excelsissimae, ubi dominus ascendit, et dixit ei his qui temptabat eum . . ." Aetheria, however, is protagonist as well as narrator, noting her progress from place to place—and from knowledge to greater knowledge. She writes in such a manner as to make us share her experiences, and her thoughts or perplexities. For with Aetheria, the "act of identification" is a problem the solution of which, as we have seen, often involves laborious, repetitive explanations (not to be found in the *Itinerarium*). What the two texts have in common is the factual *ex post*-attitude of the guidebook. The places where miracles have happened are inventoried

is an archaeological revery written by a sensitive *homme de lettres*),[19] but a factual account of a voyage written by a *representative* of general Christianity. In such an account the personal element is important, not *per se*, but only insofar as it gives a body to the "representative I"; in this respect, our *Peregrinatio* is no different from that account of a voyage to the beyond which begins: "Nel mezzo del cammin di *nostra* vita mi ritrovai."

Unfortunately, the French critics, as represented in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, s. v. *Etheria*, have given in to the biographical bias which was rampant at the time (1922) in academic literary history, and not only in France (one may remember its detrimental effect on the study of Dante). The earlier attempt of Dom Morin to identify with Aetheria that unnamed dissolute woman of Sardanapalian habits who was indicted by her contemporary Saint Jerome (an identification borne out by no evidence either historic or linguistic, for in view of the language of the *Peregrinatio* the sixth-century dating of Meister seems to me more plausible; cf. also the remark of Muller, p. 158) has induced those writers to center on the private personality of Aetheria and, of course, to return an unfavorable verdict. We are told that Aetheria, who mentions meeting only one woman on her travel (the nun Marthana), has the habit "de ne rechercher que la compagnie des hommes" (p. 576); if she addresses her fellow nuns back in Europe as "dominae sorores uenerabiles, lumen animae meae," her words, inspired by spiritual sisterhood, are dismissed as "toutes appellations fort touchantes qui ne semblent pas d'ailleurs l'attirer outre mesure à se retrouver dans la pieuse compagnie" (p. 561); when she makes the point that the conversation of the "sancti episcopi vel sancti monachi" whom she met at the frontier of the Roman Empire was limited exclusively to discussions of the Scriptures and of the deeds of holy men, this detail is supposed to have been inserted in order to forestall any possible "malicious rumors" which, because of her reputation, she had good rea-

---

and the suspension that captures the reader of the Scriptures when he watches the miracles in the making (and it is a part of the miracles that the infinite God who intervenes in the finite world causes them to happen at just *this* place) gives way, in the account of the pilgrimage, to a recapitulative mood in which the reader must look at the miracles as *having happened* at just this place: *ibi est ubi* . . . (we could compare with this *ex post*-factualism the natural way in which Aetheria, here too anticipating mediaeval use, generously bestows the epithet *sanctus* on the figures of the Old Testament who, while distinguished by God's intervention in their private lives, were in reality not at all saints).

[19] Cf. Chateaubriand, *Itinéraire*, Preface, pp. 70-71 (in the edition of Emile Malakis, 1946): "Je prie donc le lecteur de regarder cet Itinéraire, moins comme un Voyage que comme des Mémoires d'une année de ma vie . . . Au reste c'est l'homme, beaucoup plus que l'auteur que l'on verra partout; je parle éternellement de moi . . ."

son to fear (p. 578)![20] But all this French worldly snickering prompted by literary detective work, all this reading of disingenuous intentions into Aetheria's impersonal text, as baseless as it is base, stems from a misunderstanding of the genre to which the *Peregrinatio* belongs. This genre, as we have said, requires systematic idealization. We feel a whole machinery smoothly working to bring together the parties interested in a common cause. The holy men appear not as individuals, but as representatives of an ideal type of "informant"; they can speak only of holy matters and express themselves (XXI, 3) only "illis sermonibus quos dignum erat de ore illorum procedere." It is the requirement of sanctity, not any personal desire to whitewash *herself*, which suggests to Aetheria this *mise en scène*; all that is irrelevant to such a didactic presentation is eliminated by Aetheria in a manner reminiscent of mediaeval paintings focusing on one main point important for the believers. The other persons involved in her pilgrimage are never individualized. The servants of her necessarily numerous suite are never mentioned;[21] the

[20] Dom Férotin infers from the reverential tone with which Aetheria addresses her fellow nuns (*dominae uenerabiles sorores meae, lumen meum*, etc.) that they were her elders and that she was "encore à la fleur l'âge." But from passages such as XXIII, 10 ("si autem et post hoc in corpore fuero . . . memores mei esse dignamini, siue in corpore siue iam extra corpus fuero") one could as well assume her to be elderly.

[21] Not only are the members of Aetheria's party never mentioned; it is also true that there is, at least in the extant fragment, no direct reference made to the presence of the group as such, either by Aetheria, or by any of the other characters (for example, while Aetheria is often addressed by priests as *filia*, there is no "group-vocative" addressed to her company). I have found, indeed, only one indirect reference to Aetheria's suite: XIV, 1, "Statim ergo ut haec audiui, descendimus *de animalibus*." Here, of course, because of the plural *animalibus*, we must interpret the *descendimus* quite literally, as a reference to Aetheria and her company. But what of the scores of other cases in which Aetheria seems to be addressed as *vos*, or, when speaking of herself, she uses *nos* of her own activities (and even feelings: X, 9, "nos satis auidi optati sumus ire"; XII, 4, "Tunc nos gauisi satis statim egressi sumus foras")? Should all such cases, likewise, be interpreted as literal plurals, or may we have to do, at times, with a *pluralis majestatis*? Or perhaps—since we sometimes find *tu* and *vos*, *ego* and *nos* alternating in the same passage—must we assume a weakening of the connotation of majesty in the plurals so that singular and plural could be used in the same sentence nearly synonymously, with, perhaps, only a slight nuance of formality in the plurals, as in Muller's example (pp. 161-162) from Gregory the Great ("Ego autem indignus pietatis *vestrae* famulus . . .jure privato loquor quia, Serenissime Domine, ex illo jam tempore dominus *fuisti*")? If we take one long passage (which was mentioned in part above) in its context as a sample, it will, at least, become clear that the third possibility is to be ruled out:

XIII, 4."Ego autem cum uiderem locum tam gratum *requisiui*, quisnam locus esset ille tam amenus. Tunc dictum est michi: 'Haec est ciuitas regis Melchisedech . . . in summitatem ipsius fabricam quam *uides* ecclesia est . . .' XIV, 1. Statim ergo ut haec *audiui, descendimus de animalibus* . . . qui [the guides] *nos* statim suscipientes duxerunt suso ad ecclesiam. Ubi cum *uenissemus* . . . 2. Cum ergo *descendissemus* . . . ait *nobis* ipse sanctus presbyter: 'Ecce ista fundamenta in giro colliculo isto, quae *uidetis* . . . 3. Nam ecce ista uia, quam *uidetis* . . .'

anonymous figures appointed to read the Scriptures at regular intervals are summed up in a *legitur*; the military authorities (*tribuni* or *praepositi*) who provide for her safety are mentioned, but not presented. As for the inhabitants of the East, we see only—again as in mediaeval paintings—worshipping crowds in the churches of Jerusalem.[22] (How different in this respect is the attitude of the gregarious if melancholy Monsieur de Chateaubriand, whose servant Julien is the "deuterago-

XV, 1. Tunc ergo quia *retinebam* scriptum esse . . . *requisiui* de eo . . .·Tunc ait ille sanctus presbyter: '. . . Nam si *uis*, ecce modo pedibus duco *uos* ibi. Nam haec aqua . . . quam uidetis . . .' 2. Tunc ergo gratias ei agere *coepi* et rogare, ut duceret *nos* ad locum . . . Statim ergo *cepimus* ire cum eo . . . donec *peruueniremus* usque ad hortum . . . , ubi ostendit *nobis* . . . 3. Tunc dixit *nobis* ipse sanctus presbyter: 'In hodie hic hortus . . . appellatur greco sermone . . . id est quod *uos* dicitis latine hortus sancti Iohannis.' "

In this passage the alternating *tu* and *vos*, *ego* and *nos* are not actually applied to the same person. The plurals are true plurals, throughout the passage, and refer only to the group; in general an *ego* of the speaker (e.g. *uiderem*) is followed by an *ego* (*mihi*) and, in a speech addressed to this *ego*, by a *tu* (*uides*), and similarly a *nos* by a *nos* (resp. *vos*): *descendissemus—nobis—uidetis*. If we find in some cases alternation of singular and plural, this is occasioned by shifts of attention on the part of the speaker (whether the narrator or a character in the narrative) from Aetheria to her group. In our selection, we find alternations within the same sentence, because, evidently, the attention suddenly shifted from the protagonist to her suite: "statim ergo ut haec *audiui—descendimus* de animalibus"—when Aetheria hears the words addressed to her ("dictum est mihi"), the whole group decides unanimously to alight. "Nam si *uis*, ecce modo pedibus duco *uos* ibi"—the priest, after having answered the question asked him by Aetheria, continues in the second singular ("nam si *uis*") to announce that if Aetheria so wishes, he will lead her group to the place in question. The easy shift from singular to plural (and vice versa) must ultimately mean that the author Aetheria (who stylizes the speeches in the *Peregrinatio*) feels herself ever surrounded by a suite (affording her a background of majesty) which is in harmony with her and knows somehow beforehand what her decisions will be. It is for them that she speaks and asks questions like a choragus, but the decisions are, in true mediaeval fashion, unanimous decisions of a (this time silent) chorus. And we may also understand as expressions of group feeling the cases mentioned above: *nos satis auidi optati sumus; tunc nos gauisi satis egressi sumus foras*—as a projection onto the group of what Aetheria has expressed for herself in the words *ut sum satis curiosa* (XVI, 3). We shall not be surprised to find in general in the *Peregrinatio* a group feeling in analogous situations expressed now in the singular, now in the plural: XXIII, 8, "agens Christo Deo nostro gratias, quod *michi indignae et non merenti* praestare dignatus est tantam gratiam"; XVI, 4, "Deo gratias agentes, qui *nobis non merentibus* singula, quae desiderabamus, dignabatur ostendere." Clearly, the "we of the group" or "we of religious solidarity"—which comes very close to the "didactic I"—is another feature of the idealizing technique in our *Peregrinatio*.

[22] We find in G. Krüger, *Preussische Jahrbücher* (1890), p. 502, the statement: "Dass Scenen von Lärm und Prügelei vorgekommen seien [in the churches of Jerusalem], wie sie von den heutigen Reisenden gemeldet werden, dürfen wir nicht annehmen; die offenbar sehr ernste Silvia würde nicht verfehlt haben dergleichen anzumerken." Here we recognize the typical attitude of the older critics. Krüger assumes quite gratuitously that the "earnest" Aetheria must offer realistic pictures of what she saw. But, precisely because of her "earnestness," she must have omitted what did not fit into her idealistic picture. We shall never know from her account whether noise and brawls did or did not occur in the Palestinian churches of that time.

nist" of the *Itinéraire* and who is ready to sketch medallions of whoever comes his way!) And even the individual Aetheria herself is, in a sense, eliminated from this account; she exists only as a pilgrim, just as the holy men exist only as informants. For the most part, she appears a very busy and alert pilgrim, an energetic identifier of facts and places.[23] More than on roads and mule paths, she travels on the theocratic soil of the oecumenic Church. Occasionally, however, she interrupts the sequence of enumerations and the laborious and monotonous factual commentary to weave into her account considerations of the spiritual aspects of the task she has set herself—and then her style becomes informed with a new rhythm. As she dwells on the ideal qualities which are requisite to such an enterprise, her soul seems to expand and there is a new breadth, a sweep to her sentences. In such cases she seems to have regained—a point that has not been made by Wölfflin and Löfstedt—the ancient art of periodizing thought to have been lost in her time. In this regard, Erich Auerbach in his *Mimesis* (pp. 91 seq.), when contrasting the way of writing of Gregory of Tours with that of the classical Roman historians, was able to state that, while the latter maintained a distance between themselves and the factual events, described by them by means of the syntactic or (as Auerbach says) "strategic" arrangements of the events in flexible periods, Gregory "ordnet nicht oder ordnet schlecht"; he dwells heavily on the concrete events, without any attempt at subordinating them to his auctorial design. If we compare Aetheria's style with that of Gregory as described by Auerbach, we find that, while equally constrained by the necessity of presenting facts, her prose gains poise and amplitude when she comes to treat her basic theme, the enthusiastic collaboration of soul and body, of individual and community, of human and divine will implied by the pilgrimage. III, 2: "Hac sic ergo iubente Christo Deo nostro adiuta orationibus sanctorum, qui comitabantur, et sic cum grandi labore, quia pedibus me ascendere necesse erat, quia prorsus nec in sella ascendi poterat, tamen ipse labor non sentiebatur (ex ea parte autem non sentiebatur labor, quia desiderium, quod habebam, iubente Deo uidebam compleri): hora ergo quarta peruenimus in . . . Syna . . ." Such a period is the reflection of a soul poised in itself; the body obeys the mind (on the relationship of *labor* with *desiderium*, cf. also XIII, 1) and the mind is perfectly balanced between its desire (*desiderium*) and the will of God (*iubente Christo Deo nostro*); see the similar formula, XVII, 1, *uolui iubente Deo*; or X, 2, "*Deus* noster

[23] The reading from the Scriptures of passages pertaining to the holy places represents the only form of dramatic re-enactment that is a part of the pilgrimage program. But, outside of the group composed of Aetheria (and her company) and the priests, there take place, as Aetheria tells us, orgiastic rituals performed by the crowds of Oriental worshippers; the Resurrection, or the Passion, is re-enacted with wails (*rugitus et mugitus*) for a period of three hours (XXIV, 10; XXXVII, 7).

Iesus, qui sperantes in se non deseret, etiam et in hoc *uoluntati meae effectum praestare* dignatus est." A similarly balanced period is to be found in V, 12:

Et licet semper Deo in omnibus gratias agere debeam, non dicam in his tantis et talibus, quae circa me conferre dignatus est indignam et non merentem, ut perambularem omnia loca, quae mei meriti non erant: tamen etiam et illis omnibus sanctis nec sufficio gratias agere, qui meam paruitatem dignabantur in suis monasteriis libenti animo suscipere uel certe per omnia loca deducere, quae ego semper iuxta scripturas sanctas requirebam.

Here, the gratitude of the pilgrim appears harmoniously divided between God and her saintly guides who both "deign" (*dignatus est—dignabantur*) to help her on her pilgrimage.[24] As for the happy relationship between the pilgrim and the guides, this cannot be expressed with greater dignity and solemnity than in the two following examples:

XIV, 2: [descendimus de animalibus . . .] Cum ergo descendissemus, ait nobis ille sanctus presbyter iam senior et de scripturis bene instructus, id est qui ipsi loco praeerat ex monacho, cui presbytero et episcopi plurimi, quantum postmodum cognouimus uitae ipsius testimonium grande ferebant, nam hoc de ipso dicebant, dignus qui praesit in hoc loco, ubi sanctus Melchisedech aduenientem sanctum Abraam hostias Deo puras primus optulit: cum ergo descendissemus, ut superius dixi, de ecclesia deorsum, ait nobis ipse sanctus presbyter . . .

Between the two river banks represented by the parallel complex clauses (*cum ergo descendissemus, ait nobis ille sanctus presbyter*) there flows a majestic, tranquil period redounding to the honor of the worthy bishop.

XIX, 5 [a passage already quoted above]: Et quoniam sanctus episcopus ipsius ciuitatis, uir uere religiosus et monachus et confessor, suscipiens me libenter ait michi: "Quoniam uideo te, filia, gratia religionis tam magnum laborem tibi imposuisse, ut de extremis porro terris uenires ad haec loca, itaque ergo, si libenter habes, quaecumque loca sunt hic grata ad uidendum Christianis, ostendimus tibi": tunc ergo gratias agens Deo primum et sic ipsi rogaui plurimum, ut dignaretur facere quod dicebat.

This period contains a period (the speech of the bishop),[25] so that the majesty of the churchman is echoed by that of the narrator. One will notice the parallelism of the two *quondam* (as well as that of the two *libenter*); we see Aetheria bowing before the bishop and the bishop

[24] The ceremonious attitude which adopts the same forms when expressed toward God and toward His representatives on earth is, as is well known, a characteristic of any Catholic church service; genuflexions are addressed to the bishop presiding over the service as well as to God, and both are addressed as "Lord" (the one, it is true, with the classical form *Domine*, the other with the Vulgar Latin *domne*). This feature of worldly politeness within the framework of the Church adds to the characteristic order and poise of the religious function.

[25] One notices the ceremonious tone of the priest's words (as of other similar speeches) addressed to Aetheria, a tone quite at variance from that which the same church dignitaries adopted to their parishioners: Löfstedt (p. 310) has noted the "fatherly friendliness" of the colloquial diminutive and the popular ring of the

bowing before her in an exchange of polite words destined to emphasize their equality of standing in the pursuit of the common Christian cause, their equality in (fatherly or daughterly) *pietas*. The plural *Christianis* used by the bishop ("I will show *you* those places that are important *for the Christians*") is very significant; it tempers somewhat the extraordinary feat of Aetheria, who has come from the end of the earth. She is told that what she sees is important for *any* Christian; and Aetheria herself knows that she is only obeying Christian instincts (XVII, 2): "Nam mihi credat uolo affectio uestra, quoniam ***nullus christianorum*** est, qui non se tendat illuc gratia orationis." The simple sublimity of such passages reveals to us a graphic portrait of the personality of the pilgrim Aetheria. At the same time, we see developed in such passages that mediaeval epic pattern according to which the action of a particular person is represented within the general framework of an ideal. Aetheria does what any Christian must do,[26] as the Old French poets would say: ". . . fait que chrestienne."

Underlying all the stylistic details of Aetheria's prose which I have attempted to analyze, there is, then, the ever-present picture of a pilgrim who feels assured of God's blessing in her enterprise and in whom desire and reward have become one—who, in her account, expresses over and over again one particular emotion, the joy of seeing with her own eyes the holy places she had known from her acquaintance with the Bible and of identifying them (with the help of similarly pious guides), a joy which she endeavors to communicate to her fellow nuns. This emotion

dativus commodi in a remark made after a church service in Jerusalem by a bishop to the flock of worshippers: "Ite interim nunc unusquisque ad *domumcellas* uestras et sedete *uobis*" (XXXVI, 5).—Recently, Professor Christine Mohrmann (*Mél. Marouzeau*, 1948, p. 443) has pointed out in the *Peregrinatio* certain "éléments artificiels de la langue et du style" of "cette pèlerine un peu précieuse" (e. g., the avoidance by Aetheria of the adjective in the type *majestas dominica)*. Cf. also note 14.

[26] Miss Hatcher in her article, "Epic Patterns in Old French" (*Word*, II, 19 seq.), has studied result constructions in the Old French epic poems, showing that the majority would be represented in modern French by simple sentences. In Old French, however, they often served to present an individual object or action within the framework of the ideal, in conformity therewith: "Arreé furent telement K'en l'arroi ne failli noient"="They were equipped in such a way that nothing was lacking in the equipment"; "Et il le comant en faisoient De cuer, si que plus ne povoient"="They obeyed the command with all their heart, so that they could not have done more"; "en fist grandement son deveir, Si que il n'ot k'amender"="He did his duty nobly so that is was not to be improved upon." We are not surprised to find this mediaeval pattern already established in the writings of our ideal-seeking Aetheria: III, 8, "Cum tamen *ita* infiniti essent [colliculi], ut non me putarem *aliquando altiores uidisse* . . . fines Saracenorum infinitos *ita* subter nos inde uidebamus, *ut credi uix possit*"; XXXVII, 7, "Ad singulas autem lectiones et orationes *tantus* affectus et gemitus totius populi est, *ut mirum sit*; nam nullus est . . . qui non illa die illis tribus horis *tantum* ploret, *quantum nec extimari possit*." This is another clear example of Romance stylistic patterns anticipated in Vulgar Latin.

occasionally colors her style (generally characterised by a mixture of didactic precision and naive belief) with that deep-felt serenity which, after so many centuries, we are still able to sense directly from the text of her account.

The characterization of Aetheria by Dom Férotin in *Revue des questions historiques*, LXXIV, p. 369 (which is repeated in the article "Etheria" of Cabrol's *Dict. des antiquités chrét.*) is in the main correct:

> Dans un latin vulgaire plein de simplicité, j'allais dire de bonhomie, mais qui ne manque pas de charme et où déborde à chaque page un saint enthousiasme pour les souvenirs bibliques, elle nous fait l'histoire de son aventureux pèlerinage. Partout où elle passe, et aucun obstacle ne l'arrête, elle veut tout contempler de ses propres yeux. Elle est avide aussi de tout savoir, de tout entendre de ce qui peut alimenter sa dévotion. Sa curiosité sous ce rapport est insatiable. Elle en fait naïvement l'aveu: "Je suis très curieuse," dit-elle, et ses nombreuses questions nous confirment qu'elle n'a pas exagéré. Depuis les passages des Ecritures, qui ont trait aux lieux saints qu'elle visite, jusqu'aux récits parfois bien naïfs des solitaires, qui lui font les honneurs de leurs modestes églises et la comblent de bénédictions et d'eulogies, tout est matière à édification pour la pieuse pèlerine.

I suspect only that, in line with the French biographical approach mentioned above, Dom Férotin takes Aetheria's reference to her "curiosity" too much as a confession of a personal weakness (excusable in a young being?), in the vein of similar autobiographical confessions—for example, those of Saint Theresa. But I wonder if Aetheria's pious curiosity was not a virtue and was not felt by her as a necessary ingredient in the pilgrim. And Dom Férotin has failed to recognize in her words that more specific "archaeological curiosity" of Aetheria's which I have stressed throughout this article. For the phrase *ut sum satis curiosa* (which I quoted above in its context) is meant to express just this particular type of curiosity, which manifests itself also in other passages of the *Peregrinatio*: X, 9 (when it is suggested that she visit the rock struck by Moses), "Quod cum dixisset, *nos satis auidi optati sumus* ire, et *statim* diuertentes a uia secuti sumus presbyterum"; XII, 4 (when it is suggested that she visit the different holy places on Mount Nebo), "Tunc nos *gauisi satis statim* egressi sumus foras." These plurals, referring to the group of which Aetheria is only an exponent, as we showed in note 21, prove that the author is not ascribing any particular feature (of weakness?) to herself when she says *ut sum satis curiosa*, but is simply voicing, in her truly mediaeval "didactic I," the feelings of *the* pilgrim, of any pilgrim—endeavoring to express that promptness of interest[27] in which true devotion reveals itself (centuries later, Thomas

[27] To this promptness of activity in the service of God we might relate a certain linguistic feature of Aetheria's style, the tendency represented by the frequent verbal compounds with *per* which give the action a perfective (voluntaristic) aspect. Löfstedt, p. 92, has treated only the cases of double compound verbs, of compounds reinforced by *per* (*persubire, peraccedere, perdiscoperire*), which cases

Aquinas will define the latter as "voluntas *prompte* tradendi se ad ea quae pertinent ad Dei famulatum") and to which she is confident God always responds by granting her the fulfilment of all her pious desires (V, 12; XX, 6; XXIII, 8-9 et al.) Aetheria's form of archaeological curiosity rests on her belief that in this particular Oriental setting which she, the Westerner, is visiting, the Biblical miracles have realistically materialized.[28] She does not belong to the spiritual family of the apostle Saint Thomas who had to put his finger into the wounds of the Lord in order to believe; at her time, there already exists a firmly established Christian tradition, and Aetheria only asks her guides the questions which may give new corroboration to that tradition. At the time when Christ was still on earth, she would have acted like her King Abgar "qui antequam uideret Dominum, credidit ei quia esset uere filius Dei" XIX, 6).[29] After Christ's death there is left for her only the *peregrinatio*

---

he subsumes under the heading "decomposition" (I would prefer the term "supercomposition"); but I connect them with the simpler type, *pervidere*, *pervigilare*, and ascribe to all these *per* compounds (whether simple or double) a perfective nuance: "cum ergo *iubente* Deo *persubissemus* in ipsa summitate"—"by the will of God we succeeded in reaching the summit" (X, 8). "Ac sic ergo, ut ceptum opus *perficeretur*, cepimus festinare, ut *peruenireмus* ad montem Nabau"—the emphasis is on pious achievement. We may also mention here such "circular phrasing" as XVII, 3: "Et quoniam de Anthiocia propius est Mesopotamiam, fuit mihi *iubente Deo* oportunum satis, ut . . . ad Mesopotamiam irem, *sicut et factum est Deo iubente*." Activity starts from God and returns to God—what is the will of God will be done. The formula *sicut et factum est*, very frequent in our text, indicates the harmony between purpose (which is identical with the will of God) and execution, or between habit and individual performance (I, 2: the guides say that it is customary to pray at the spot from which one first glimpses Mt. Sinai, *sicut et factum est*).

[28] This belief in itself is not entirely "naive": it is nurtured by solid dogmatic doctrines; such a sentence as XXXVII, 6, generally passed over by critics, "Et sic per illas tres horas docetur populus omnis nichil factum esse [sc. in the New Testament], quod non prius dictum sit [by the prophets of the Old Testament] et nichil dictum esse, quod non totum completum sit," shows an intellectual awareness on Aetheria's part of the Christian pattern of thought known as "prefiguration" or *Realprophetie* (as Auerbach calls it, *Neue Dantestudien*, Istanbul, 1944). The idea that the Old Testament "prophesies" the New is the dogmatic basis for Aetheria's visits to Old Testamentary places. Similarly, from the sentence XXXI, 3, "et sic deducetur episcopus *in eo typo*, quo tunc Dominus deductus est," we can infer that she is aware of another Christian pattern of thought, that of *imitatio Christi*; just as things before Christ "prophesy" Christ, so things after Christ (here, the Church ceremonies) must "imitate" Christ.

[29] Aetheria does not mention the authentic picture of Christ which is supposed to have been sent to King Abgar by the Lord Himself, according to a legend first attested in 544 A.D.; cf. K. Meister, *Rhein. Mus.* LXIV, 355, who finds in the absence of this feature a *terminus ad quem* for the *Peregrinatio*; also von Gärtringen, *Berl. Sitzber.* (1914), p. 823, and my article in *MPh*, XLIV, 129. As a result of this legend, the miraculous picture (*veronica*, etc.) was to eclipse the fame of the miraculous letter; it is as though the farther removed they were from the time of Christ's life on earth, the more the Christians yearned for tangible, material evidence of His presence, for positive data proving the most irrational belief. As for the letter which Aetheria is allowed to see and to handle, it is very interesting that she seems to regard this, not so much as a concrete object of veneration,

ad loca sancta; as the monk Valerius will say in his eulogy on our pilgrim: "Cuncta igitur Veteris ac Nova Testamenti *omni indagatione percurreus volumina* et quaecumque sanctorum mirabiliorum loca in diversis mundi partibus, provinciis, civitatibus, montibus, caeterisque desertis reperit esse conscripta, *sollicita expeditione*, licet per multorum annorum spatia, peregrinatione proficiscens, tandem *cuncta cum Dei jubamine perlustrans*." Aetheria, moving from West to East within the borders of the "Roman Catholic" empire[30] (Valerius: "intrepido corde immensum totius orbis arripuit iter"), under the protection of the *pax romana*, has helped, by her personal investigations "on the spot" (a task to which she devoted her life, XXIII, 10), to establish a new spiritual geography of a second homeland[31] of which all members of this Christian empire can be citizens.

The Johns Hopkins University

---

but more as a means of factual verification. She does not even describe the appearance of this centuries-old piece of parchment(?); instead, she copies it with the meticulousnes of a mediaeval scribe and subjects it to "textual criticism." The blind worship of relics which was to be so characteristic of the Middle Ages and which presupposes an identification previously established by ecclesiastical authorities, once and forever, is not yet in existence with Aetheria, who prefers to associate and collaborate with those learned men who were engrossed in the actual work of identification. We may, however, find the trend toward worship of relics foreshadowed in Aetheria's reference to the treatment of the Cross in Jerusalem; it had been found necessary to protect it from the throngs of worshippers who, in kissing the relic, would manage to bite off fragments for mementoes. Aetheria's attitude toward relics, however, her *id est* attitude, is still intellectual.

[30] At different places Aetheria makes us feel (in a matter-of-fact way, without undue insistence) the protection the Roman empire gives her pious enterprise (cf. the mentions of *disciplina romana, tribunus, praepositus, miles, castrum*, Van Oorde, s.vv.).

[31] The frequent passages in which Aetheria reports (and translates) Greek expressions she has heard from her guides (place names, names of ceremonies, etc.) have been hitherto treated by linguistic critics mainly in order to prove or disprove her lack of linguistic culture (and here again K. Meister seems to me right in disproving it). In my opinion, such passages must be considered an attempt on the part of Aetheria to familiarize the West with the sacred terms and with the living language of the East (Aetheria, unlike Jerome, does not explain the "dead" Hebrew names), an attempt to cement the spiritual unity of the Christian empire, whose "catholicity" is only enhanced by its polyglot structure. Notice the passage, XLVII, 3-4, in which she emphatically insists that at Jerusalem the bishop's explanation of the sacrament of baptism is translated from Greek into Syriac and Latin "ut omnes audiant quae exponuntur," "ne contristentur" (so that those who do not understand Greek might not be saddened). Incidentally, the habit of expressing religious concepts in the several church languages of the Empire (of the type VIII, 4, "ipse nobis dixit nomen ipsius arboris, quemadmodum appellant eam grece, id est *dendros alethiae*, quod nos dicimus *arbor ueritatis*") has persisted in a secularized form in the polyglot (English-Breton-French) names attributed to her own legendary concepts by Marie de France ("Bisclavret a nun en Bretan, Garulf l'apellent li Norman"; "Gotelef l'apelent Angleis, Chievrefueil le noment Franceis"; "Laüstic a nun, ce m'est vis, si l'apelent en lur païs [the Bretons]; ceo est russignol en Franceis e nightegale en dreit Engleis"). Polyglotism has here the ring of sacred polyglotism.

PHÈDRE ET LES POISONS: UN THÈME DE MÉDIATION TIRÈ D'EURIPIDE

MARCEL CHICOTEAU

C'EST un aspect curieux du Grand Siècle que le primitivisme du théâtre racinien. J'ai déjà constaté[1] certains développements de ce phénomène, notamment en ce qui concerne le vocabulaire mystique de Racine, tendant à enchainer, par la magie des mots, les destinées des hommes et les forces de la nature.

Antérieurement à *Phèdre,* on a pu caractériser cette technique en faisant ressortir un souci d'idéaliser les intrigues, et d'intensifier la puissance de l'environnement; en 1677, les liens entre l'être humain et la nature deviennent un ressort de médiation, et c'est dans ce sens que paraît devoir être interprété leur dynamisme.

On a l'impression que, dans ses drames profanes, Racine n'a osé parler de la nature qu'en tant que sentiment de surface. Titus, Mithridate, Agamemnon restent maitres d'eux-mêmes parmi les éléments. Phèdre, au contraire, se mesure toute entière, dans son amour physique, aux dieux. Elle oppose à une divinité bienfaisante ce qu'elle considère comme une maladie; et ce n'est que vers la fin du drame qu'elle trouve un moyen radical de se fondre avec l'empyrée. Le poison lui rend ce qu'elle avait perdu: l'équilibre de ses impulsions—la *sôphrosyné* grecque.

Il y a là une finalité que Racine n'avait pas atteinte auparavant. Au lieu de se contenter d'aspirations, de recherches, comme le faisaient les *quaesitores et consideratores* d'Aulu-Gelle, le personnage racinien fait foi d'un déterminisme intéressant:

> Déesse, venge-toi, nos causes sont pareilles . . .

Cependant, jusqu'au quatrième acte, l'homme est encore le demandeur, et les éléments sont les dieux. Il s'agit de réconcilier une conception

[1] *Modern Language Review,* XXXIX, (1944); *Comparative Literature Studies,* II (1941), XIII (1944), XVI-XVII (1945-46) et XXIII-XXIV (1946). Cf. M. Chicoteau, *Essay on the Ephectic Attitude in Regard to Destiny: Seneca, Racine & Hardy* (Cardiff, 1941).

intellectuelle (une volonté créatrice) et un état philosophique statique et acquis (la modération) ; et nous sommes prévenus, dès la première scène, que l'activité humaine ne se rendra semblable au système cosmique que par la mort :

> Cet aveu si honteux, le crois-tu volontaire ? . . .
> Délivre l'univers d'un monstre . . . !

De là l'importance dans cette pièce de la nature que Phèdre va implorer. Jusqu'ici, chez Racine, qu'il s'agisse des vents dans *Iphigénie*, des mers dans *Mithridate* ou des rivages dans *Andromaque*, le poète n'a fait qu'incorporer dans son œuvre des motifs qu'il fait correspondre à des états d'esprit préalablement affirmés. La nature a fait rebondir l'action en donnant lieu à des déplacements spirituels déjà décidés. Dans *Phèdre*, les contours naturels et les horizons entrevus s'unissent pour constituer une divinité. La liaison psychologique entre le personnage et le dieu se fait dans un esprit de panthéisme, tout en découlant d'un effort de volonté contrecarré et, finalement, épuisé :

> Je me cachois au jour, je fuyois la lumière . . .
> La mort est le seul dieu que j' osois implorer . . .

Malgré l'immensité de ce champ d'activité psychologique, les unités classiques sont respectées. Elles sont d'autant plus importantes qu'elles montrent à quel point Racine a voulu que la nature se révélât dans son intégralité.

L'action, tout en étant censée se passer à Trézène, est en réalité partout ; auprès de la mer, dans les forêts, aux enfers, dans les cieux. Mais le destin s'y accomplit, et c'est le "chemin" mystique vers la satisfaction qui vient unir et harmoniser ce site invraisemblable. En ce qui concerne l'unité de temps, les quelques heures qu'occupe le dénouement témoignent du besoin pressant où est l'auteur de faire correspondre la durée du drame au rythme de la nature ; car les langueurs de Phèdre, seul motif d'ordre temporel, s'associent à l'atmosphère du palais et semblent presque réagir au souffle d'air discrètement introduit par l'effet du langage. En revanche, l'apparition de Thésée, que l'on croyait aux enfers, est abrupte comme celle du soleil après une nuit d'attente. Enfin, l'unité d'action est empreinte d'un souci d'harmonisation spirituelle. *Phèdre* fait l'effet d'une pièce d'actualité en dépit de l'époque où elle se situe. L'homme s'y voit lié à la nature à un moment choisi de son existence. L'expiation, crise suprême, résume le passé et porte en elle l'avenir. Dès lors, tout le dynamisme du *kosmos* se cencentre sur Trézène : soleil, mers, rivages et monstres viennent encercler l'individu pour l'enchainer comme un arbre en proie au lierre.

Toutefois, l'unité absolue de la pièce reste celle de la nature. L'empyrée est présent même au lever du rideau, comme un éventail, révélant

tour à tour le monde des vivants et celui des morts. Nous avons déjà dans d'autres travaux caractérisé ce procédé, qui est grec, et qui fait penser aux prismes tournants, aux *périactoi* du théâtre hellénique. Et c'est pour leur valeur humaine que Racine nous présente les sombres vallées de l'enfer, les forêts vierges, les demeures imprécises des dieux :

> Croirai-je qu'un mortel, avant sa dernière heure,
> Peut pénétrer des morts la profonde demeure?
> Quel charme l'attiroit sur ces bords redoutés?

Nous touchons là au point intéressant : "quel charme?" quelle union secrète? Il est remarquable que, pour décrire son univers, Racine n'ait pas à faire démesurément appel au surnaturel ; c'est heureux, car l'équilibre de sa pièce s'en fût ressenti. Si nous analysons la composition de sa pensée, nous nous apercevrons que ce "charme" qui unit les deux mondes provient naturellement de l'homme, de son esprit de *quaesitor*. Il n'est aucunement le fait du hasard. Racine est souvent à cent lieues d'être janséniste.

Retenons surtout ce fait : *Phèdre* se déroule dans un espace animé et intense, riche en potentialités, où néanmoins tous les éléments susceptibles d'une caractérisation verbale sont révélés sans mystère, et où ceux qui échappent à la connaissance restent tout de même vibrants dans notre subconscient. Tableau fidèle de la nature!

Avant tout, c'est une pièce *lumineuse*. Jour et nuit s'y opposent sans répit. Le clair-obscur, qui en est l'équilibre, est insinué avec poésie au début, pour devenir un fait accompli au cinquième acte. Le spectateur est partout conscient du chemin obscur de la nature, et le soleil qui "fuit" se trouve symbolisé, chez Phèdre, par le "nuage" qui s'empare graduellement d'elle par l'effet de sa drogue. Comme l'a justement fait observer Furetière, la "lumière" dans cette pièce "se prend quelquefois pour la vie," entendons : pour le principe intérieur vital, dans ses différentes tonalités et ses diverses dispositions :

> Le ciel n'est pas plus pur que le fond de mon cœur.

L'héroïne, de son côté, ne peut trouver dans le soleil ou dans la nuit infernale le réconfort moral qu'elle recherche ; c'est pourquoi elle doit avoir recours au demi-jour, qui deviendra pour elle une voie de repentir. Cela fait penser au poète des "choses crépusculaires." Il est significatif que ce soit dans une atmosphère de pénombre que Phèdre demande pardon à l'univers dont elle provient et où elle doit retourner ; et si son expiation a lieu dans un crépuscule spirituel, l'amour chaste d'Hippolyte et d'Aricie, dans les bois ténébreux, n'en est que plus frappant comme exemple de la concordance de la nature et de l'homme.

Le *chaleur* de la pièce est une répétition technique de ce phénomène. Les émotions effroyables de Phèdre s'assimilent, dès le début, à la

température physique de Trézène, et Racine va jusqu'a mettre en opposition les brûlures physiologiques de l'héroïne et l'effroi qui "glace" son époux. On peut même dire qu'à part Thésée, tous les personnages recherchent la tiédeur, car l'ancienne chaleur malsaine d'Uzès et de Byzance, que Racine reporte sur Phèdre, gagne tout son entourage. Même la perfide Œnone est réclamée par la mer.

C'est aussi le drame des *sentiments retenus*. C'est une longue série d'"aveux," de "funestes doutes," parfois de silences complets:

> Cache-moi bien plutôt, je n'ai que trop parlé . . .
> J'ai dit ce que jamais on ne devait entendre . . .

Les sentiments exprimés sont souvent incomplets (Phèdre revoyant Thésée dans Hippolyte, ce dernier assimilant son amour pour Aricie à son amour des bêtes fauves). Ce voilé, ce laisser-aller, constitue un demi-ton et traduit une gêne, au sens racinien du mot, motivée par le fait accompli et les absolus qu'il fallait réprimer.

Or, ces trois caractéristiques (crépuscule, tiédeur, et retenue d'émotions) s'appliquent tout autant à la divinité grecque qu'à l'univers louisquatorzien. La modération est une doctrine delphique et aussi un précepte de Boileau. Mais, exception faite de Fénelon, Racine est le seul auteur du Grand Siècle qui se soit attaché à trouver dans la cosmologie la contrepartie—ou même l'origine—des tendances de discrétion qui sont à la base de la pensée littéraire de son temps. Pour en faire foi, il introduit un ressort, qui servira de point d'équilibre. La réussite de sa thèse comportait nécessairement la mise en valeur d'un élément modérateur, apte à ramener l'homme sur la voie dont il s'était écarté, capable d'affermir son bonheur, susceptible de suspendre toute influence adverse, afin d'entrainer une épuration totale. Nul moyen n'était plus approprié que celui dont il s'est servi, car c'est la nature elle-même qui le lui fournit; et si l'égarement devait être symbolisé par l'*amour*, l'élément redresseur devait être un produit naturel, le *poison*, présenté sous forme de charme divin, ou de sortilège.

Pour marquer le caractère mystique de cette médiation ultime, soulignons le premier essai de Phèdre pour recouvrer son équilibre par un moyen humain: la reine veut mourir par l'*épée*. Dans le troisième acte de la tragèdie, il y a transposition d'un passage homérique que Racine avait assez longuement commenté dans sa jeunesse, et dont il avait alors tiré la conclusion que "pour surmonter la volupté il faut du courage et de la tempérance." Mais la mort violente n'est pas une expiation satisfaisante; et Racine, qui a toujours le souci de l'imagerie verbale, choisit le poison parce que c'est un philtre antidote, et parce que ce thème évoque dans son esprit intuitif les plus poétiques possibilités.

Il a même pu influencer, plus qu'on ne le croit, les idées du poète dans sa jeunesse. Qu'on se souvienne de quelques incidents: tels commen-

taires sur le philtre de Circé, sur la bride de Pallas; telle description de l'empoisonnement d'une jeune fille à Uzès; et surtout, telle impression d'amertume ressentie lors de la malédiction de Nicole. Car n'est-ce pas bien l'"empoisonneur public Jean Racine" qui se venge:

> Le fer aurait déjà tranché ma destinée,
> Mais je laissois gémir la vertu soupçonnée...
> Je connois mes fureurs, je les rappelle toutes...
> Toi-même en ton esprit rappelle le passé...

Certes, le philtre de Circé était bienfaisant, comme les "charmes" qu'évite Hippolyte. Mais en partant de cette idée que la nature ne peut rien de mal, Racine développe la pensée de Pline l'Ancien: "Tellus genuit venena: ecquis invenit illa, praeter hominem?" C'est abord, d'une manière assez inattendue, Oreste, dans *Andromaque*, qui répond, pour continuer la citation: "Non et homines quidem ut venena nascuntur? Atra ceu serpentium lingua vibrat" (Pour qui sont ces serpents qui sifflent sur nos têtes?); et la pensée est reprise, presque textuellement encore, par Phèdre: "tabesque animi contacta adurit culpantium omnia" (Je sentis tout mon corps et transir et brûler).

Cette même idée (celle de l'homme en tant qu'unique artisan de ses malheurs) est celle qui nous mène de l'empoisonnement de la jeune uzétienne à celui de Phèdre. Mais alors que celle-là avait voulu "se venger de son père qui l'avoit querellée parce qu'on croyoit qu'elle étoit grosse," Phèdre éteint la lumière de ses jours parce qu'elle se sait irrémédiablement coupable:

> Il se tairoit en vain. Je sais mes perfidies.

De même on peut se figurer que le venin coulant dans les artères de Phèdre est l'antidote au poison figuratif que Port-Royal versait depuis si longtemps sur la tête de son élève "rebelle."

Il se peut qu'il n'y ait là que conjectures. Elles seraient néanmoins révélatrices de l'âme du poète qui, en partant innocent de la nature et de la religion, s'envenime dans le monde, et qui, en composant *Phèdre*, prétend montrer qu'avec Mithridate on peut survivre aux poisons.

Venons-en à l'emploi textuel du thème:

> Quel charme ou quel poison en ont tari la source?...
> [Le poison] du fol amour qui trouble ma raison...
> Quel funeste poison
> L'amour a répandu sur toute ma maison!...
> Déjà jusqu'à mon cœur le venin parvenu
> Dans ce cœur expirant jette un froid inconnu...
> Et la mort, à mes yeux dérobant la clarté,
> Rend au jour, qu'ils souilloient, toute sa pureté.

Il y a là, nettement, une inspiration d'Euripide. C'est qu'en effet, pour donner au poison le qualité d'un *medium*, Racine a compris dans un sens

personnel les vers 509-510 de l' *Hippolyte*: "J'ai à la maison des philtres pour ensorceler l'amour . . ."

Un commentateur contemporain a déjà signalé la tendance des Grecs à utiliser l'expression ambiguë.[2] Et si nous nous reportons à l'étude de ce passage, nous pourrons, sans solécisme, interpréter le "philtre ensorceleur de l'amour" dans un sens peut-être plus près de la pensée d'Euripide: "antidote sous forme de sortilège contrecarrant l'effet de l'amour." Le procédé n'implique qu'un simple enjambement et le sens rappelle certain *leitmotiv* du *Songe d'une Nuit d'Eté*. En ce qui concerne la tragédie grecque, il faut ajouter que les vers 447-449 justifient cette manière de voir.

D'ailleurs le mot **θελκτήρια**, bien plus riche que sa contrepartie dans le langage précieux (charmant), vient du radical **θέλγω**, que le dramaturge français emploie dans sa double signification homérique, *intoxiquer* et *tromper*:

> Par un *charme fatal* vous fûtes *entraînée* . . .

Nous avons dit que *Phèdre* exemplifierait la sôphrosyné des temps anciens. M. Stanford[3] estime qu'il en est de même chez Euripide. Quoi qu'on en dise du mariage de Racine, qui devait se faire peu de temps après *Phèdre*, il n'est pas impossible que cette tragédie ait été, en quelque sorte, sa *Bonne Chanson*. Cela expliquerait bien des choses, et notamment la raison pour laquelle il a "fait Hippolyte amoureux," chose qu'Arnauld ne s'expliquait pas. Et si, comme le poète le dit dans sa *Préface*, "la seule pensée du crime y est regardée avec autant d'horreur que le crime même," c'est sans doute parce que, comme le répétera à son tour Verlaine, "c'en est fait . . . des funestes pensées, et des mauvais rêves . . . et des mots où l'esprit, sans l'âme, triomphait."

Affirmons plus spécifiquement que la modération, la *médiation*, qui caractérise *Phèdre*, tient à ce fait que l'amour y est considéré comme une maladie, et que la guérison nécessite un renoncement à la vie. L'amour d'Hippolyte, bien qu'il symbolise l'état normal du bonheur, est suffoqué parce qu'il a part à ce renoncement. Il faut que l'expiation soit totale; et les choses d'ici-bas sont liées comme celles de l'éther supérieur.

C'est ce qui nous ramène à notre entrée en matière. Le redressement n'est pas seulement le fruit de la circonstance ou de l'action, mais de la volonté qui se soumet, individuellement ou collectivement, à l'intransigeance divine:

> Ainsi donc jusqu'au bout tu veux m'empoisonner,
> Malheureuse? Voilà comme tu m'as perdue.
> Au jour que je fuyois c'est toi qui m'as rendue.
> Tes prières m'ont fait oublier mon devoir . . .
> Va, laisse-moi le soin de mon sort déplorable!

[2] W. B. Stanford, dans *Hermathena*, LXIII (1944).
[3] *Op. cit.*

Et c'est ici également qu'entre de nouveau dans notre exposé le somptueux panorama de la pièce; et cela, comme nous le disions, à titre de réalité et non plus de décor. Car n'est-il pas vrai que, pour vaincre l'effet du poison charmeur, le *kosmos* tout entier se resserre autour de cette femme, "triste rebut de la nature entière," depuis Apollon jusqu'à Minos? Tout l'univers est plein de ses aïeux. La lumière du jour, n'est-ce pas avant tout celle qui éclaire Phèdre elle-même? L'ombre des forêts a beau être bienfaisante: c'est Phèdre qui voudrait avoir le courage d'y être assise, et c'est elle qui voudrait pouvoir, comme sa nourrice, se plonger dans la mer. Tout le "scénario" signifie pour elle un redressement par l'écartement des tendances extrêmes; et Racine donne justement à la *scène* ce sens ancien et véritable, de *σκιά-*, *ombre*:

> Il me semble déjà que ces murs, que ces voûtes,
> Vont prendre la parole ... prêts à m'accuser!

La coupable ne peut trouver, dans la nature extérieure, dans le sein de ses ancêtres, ou dans le décor théâtral, le soulagement expiatoire; toutefois sa personne reste le centre de la pièce, et s'il y a lutte de volontés, il y a confession parce qu'elle comprend le besoin de s'identifier à la nature. Sa *réconciliation* est une reconnaissance du principe chrétien. C'est une *conciliation*.

> La mort à mes yeux dérobant la clarté
> *Rend* au jour, qu'ils souilloient, toute sa pureté ...
> Il faut à votre fils *rendre* son innocence.

Il est même assez curieux d'avoir à constater que, dans un drame du Grand Siècle, l'expression verbale et la plasticité du langage ne sont que des consolations vaines:

> Vivons, si vers la vie on peut me ramener ...
> Elle a trois fois écrit, et changeant de pensée,
> Trois fois elle a rompu sa lettre commencée ...

Voilà pourquoi Phèdre, être empreint de mysticisme, revient à une mort, lente comme ses aveux, suspendant sa raison, lui faisant revivre ses erreurs passées, voilant le jour, contrecarrant la nuit, refroidissant ses chaleurs et réchauffant ses veines glaciales. Elle atteint figurativement un "locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis"; car en passant par la *κρᾶσις* d'Hippocrate, l'*ἐποχή* d'Arcesilaüs, elle en arrive à la *pax* chrétienne. *Phèdre* est comme une peinture du Purgatoire. Il faut prendre le "chemin ouvert" qui "descend parmi les morts," en se purgeant du "pesant fardeau," des "poids odieux." Pour que la "raison" ne soit plus "troublée," il faut que le "repos" soit "affermi." Les forces muettes ont été conjurées, et le péché a été avoué.

Que dire du monde d'au-delà chez Racine? On ne le voit guère qu'à travers des symboles bienfaisants. Cette vision nous parait loin d'être

janséniste, car elle est cousue d'idéalités auxquelles l'esprit humain peut, par des transformations complexes, atteindre. Pour y parvenir, il convient d'être "obsédé" par les points de contact entre l'humanité et la divinité. Les tragédies raciniennes ne font guère que voiler cette "porte étroite" ; mais il n'en reste pas moins vrai que dans ces œuvres, l'au-delà heureux est représenté comme un état statique qui a plus de rapports avec la personnalité qu'il n'en a avec le caractère ; tandis que le monde réel est une force dynamique mais éphémère, sujette aux intempéries de l'atmosphère civilisatrice. Elevé dans celui-ci, tendant vers celui-là, l'homme ne se retrouve tout entier que par un effort de fermeté et de constance.

Liverpool

THE PEDIGREE OF A *SONETO A LO DIVINO*

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

IT IS a well-known fact that one of the forms assumed by the reaction to the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch during the Renaissance took the shape of a spiritualization of the amorous lyrics in the collection. The leader in this movement was Gerolamo Malipiero with his *Petrarca spirituale (sonetti et canzoni di Francesco Petrarca divenuto theologo et spirituale)*, first printed in Venice in 1536 and reprinted at least nine times thereafter. Among the followers of Malipiero were Feliciano Umbruno da Civitella with his *Dialogo del dolce morire di Gesù Cristo sopra le sei visioni di M. Francesco Petrarca* (1544), Gian Giacomo Salvatorino with his *Thesoro de Sacra Scrittura sopra Rime del Petrarca* (1547), and Pietro Vincenzo Sagliano with his *Esposizione spirituale sopra il Petrarca* (1590).[1] That in Italy this spiritualization was not limited to Petrarch we may note from the following title: *Scielta delle Rime Amorose del Sig. Torquato Tasso. Fatta spirituale dal Cavalier Selva, medico parmigiano* (Modena, 1611).

A similar reaction spread to Spain. Sebastián de Córdova wrote *Las obras de Boscán y Garcilaso trasladadas en materias christianas y religiosas* (1575), and Juan Andosilla Larramendi, *Cristo Nuestro Señor en los versos del príncipe de nuestros poetas, Garcilaso de la Vega, sacados de diferentes partes y unidos con ley de centones* (1628).[2] In 1580 was published the work of Bartolomé Ponce, *Primera parte de la Clara Diana, repartida en siete libros*,[3] a divinization of the *Diana* of Jorge de Montemayor. There is no literary merit whatsoever in any

[1] See chapter on "Petrarchismo e anti-petrarchismo" in Arturo Graf's *Attraverso il Cinquecento* (Torino, 1888), pp. 79-85. According to the British Museum catalog, Salvatorino's *Thesoro* was published in Venice in 1537. This is probably incorrect, since Salvatorino tells us himself that he began the work in 1537 at the age of thirty-three and that he spent two years on it.

[2] See Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, vol. XIII, *Juan Boscán* (Madrid, 1908), pp. 391-397. Palau y Dulcet's *Manual del librero hispano-americano*, I, 314, states that Andosilla's composition appeared in 1528; but this is an obvious typographical error.

[3] The usual publication date given for Bartolomé Ponce is 1582. However, Palau y Dulcet, *op. cit.*, VI, 136, notes that it was first printed at Epila in 1580 and that Nicolás Antonio cites a Zaragoza edition of 1581.

of these writings; but one collection, that of Sebastián de Córdova, furnished raw materials which the genius of San Juan de la Cruz later transmuted into the sublimest poetry that has come out of Spain.[4]

It may be of some interest to trace this spiritualized tendency back a little further on the Spanish side. Among the poems in the *Floresta de varias poesías* of Diego Ramírez Pagán (Valencia, 1562)[5] is the following sonnet captioned "Soneto a Nuestra Señora del Alua":

Sossegado està el mar selua y prados
la hoja y flor su pompa muestra al cielo,
la noche vi rompiendo apriessa el velo
sus cauallos herir negros y alados.
Scyntia dexa los campos plateados
de vn transparente y christallino yelo,
resplandecían del señor de Delo
los orientales rayos colorados.
Quando otro sol más puro de occidente
veys donde assoma serenando el día,
la ymagen oriental descolorando.
Y dixo.—Eterna luz sola y ardiente
suffrid en paz la hermosura mía
que más clara que vos se va mostrando.

(m, vii)

This turns out to be virtually a translation of a sonnet by Anton Francesco Rinieri.[6] Compare:

Era tranquillo il mar; le selve e i prati
Scuoprian le pompe sue, fior frondi al cielo;
Et la notte sen gia squarciando il uelo,
Et spronando i Cavai foschi & alati;
Scuotea l'aurora da capegli aurati
Perle d'un uiuo trasparente gielo;
Et gia ruotaua il Dio, che nacque in Delo,
Raggi da i liti Eoi ricchi odorati:
Quand'ecco d'Occidente un piu bel Sole
Spuntogli incontro serenando il giorno,
E impallidio l'Orientale imago.
Velocissime luci eterne & sole,
Con uostra pace, il mio bel uiso adorno
Parue alhor piu di uoi lucente & uago.

(*Delle rime di diversi nobili hvomini et eccellenti poeti*, Vinegia, 1548, p. 22)

[4] See Dámaso Alonso, *La poesía de S. Juan de la Cruz* (Madrid, 1942), chap. II, "Boscán y Garcilaso a lo divino," pp. 47-90.

[5] For further details on Ramírez Pagán, including a number of imitations from the Italian, consult J. G. Fucilla, "Two Generations of Petrarchism and Petrarchists in Spain," *Modern Philology*, XXVII (1930), 282-288.

[6] Some information on Rinieri can be found in my "On an Apocryphal Poem in Ariosto's *Lirica*," *Modern Philology*, XXXI (1933), 128-134.

It is curious to note that all that was necessary in order to accomplish the spiritualization of the Italian composition was to invent a title for it. Thus, almost effortlessly, Rinieri's lady with her supersolar resplendence was transformed into a "Nuestra Señora del Alba." It is possible that Ramírez here was under the influence of the reaction against Petrarch started by Malipiero. However, the fact that he was a clergyman and, as such, naturally predisposed to adopt this kind of procedure, could indicate that his version was made independently of any outside factors. The imitation, unfortunately, seems to have been hastily and awkwardly done. If it may be granted any importance, it is because it is one of the earliest examples of a poem *a lo divino* written during the Spanish Renaissance.

In addition to its appearance in the *Rime di diversi* . . . , Rinieri's sonnet was printed in his *Cento sonetti* (1553), *Rime* (1554), and in Ruscelli's *I fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri* (1558, 1569). Another very similar sonnet was also published under the name of Annibal Caro in the Ruscelli anthology. As the authors were contemporaries it is a question which one was the adapter and which the model. I am inclined to consider the Rinieri version as the original and the one by his friend as its imitation, not so much on account of priority of publication, which has some validity, as on account of the greater simplicity of expression of Rinieri's sonnet as compared with the Caro composition. Imitation usually betrays itself through a more elaborated form rather than vice versa. I quote the Caro poem in order that the reader may compare and judge for himself.

Eran Teti e Giunon tranquille, e chiare,
Sol spiraua Fauonio, e fuggia Clori,
L'alma Ciprigna inanti i primi albori
Ridendo empia d'amor la terra, e 'l mare.
La rugiadosa Aurora in ciel più rare
Facea le stelle, e di più bei colori
Febo, qual più lucente in Delfo appare.
Quand 'altra aurora in più vezzoso ostello
Apparse, e rise, e girò lieto e puro
Il Sol, che sol m'abbaglia, e mi disface.
Volsimi incontro allhora, e vidi oscuro
(Santi lumi del ciel con vostra pace)
L'oriente, che dianzi era si bello.

(In 1558 ed. of *I fiori*, p. 50)[7]

But if Caro was an imitator so was Rinieri, since we find that he drew his inspiration from the following sonnet by Ariosto:

[7] Caro's sonnet is also to be found in *Il primo volume delle rime scelte* (Venice, 1565). In Caro's *Apologia, gli amori di Dafne e Cloe, rime* (Milano, 1878), p. 49 (also in another edition, Milano, 1900, p. 249) the poem appears in a slightly different form: "Eran l'aer tranquillo e l'onde chiare, etc."

Chiuso era il sol da un tenebroso velo,
Che si stendea fin all'estreme sponde
De l'orizonte e murmurar le fronde
E tuoni andar s'udian scorrendo il cielo;
Di pioggia in dubbio o tempestoso gelo,
Stav'io per ire oltra le torbid'onde
Del fiume altier che 'l gran sepolcro asconde
Del figlio audace del signor di Delo;
Quando apparir su l'altra ripa il lume
De' bei vostri occhi vidi e udì parole
Che Leandro potean farmi quello giorno,
E tutto a un tempo i nuovoli d'intorno
Si diliguaro e si scoperse il sole;
Tacquero i venti e tranquillossi il fiume.

(*Lirica minore*, ed. Fatini, 1924, p. 37)

Rinieri's setting is obviously reversed, calm replacing the Ariostean storm, but the technique is the same. Furthermore, six of the rime words are identical in both sonnets (far too many for mere accident)—*velo, cielo, gelo, Delo, giorno, sole.* "Chiuso era il sol" was unquestionably the model of "Era tranquillo il mar."

Since we have discussed the versions of Rinieri, Caro, and Ramírez Pagán, it may not be out of place to mention here a sonnet by Lomas Cantoral.

El mar y el ayre estavan sosegados,
Sólo Favonio aspirava en buelo
Suave y manso, y de la noche el velo
Roto, mostravan su beldad los prados.
Arrojava el Aurora de rosados
Dedos, mil perlas de un luciente yelo,
Y rodeava el Dios que nasció en Delo
De rayos su sagrada faz dorados.
Quando otra bella Aurora de occidente
Salió riendo, y descubrió más puro
El sol que sólo al sumo Sol me adiestra.
Quedó luego a su luz pobre y oscuro
(Divinas lumbres con licencia vuestra)
El claro amanecer del oriente.

(*Obras poéticas*, 1578, p. 47)

A line-for-line analysis of this sonnet will show that Lomas is indebted to both Caro and Rinieri and to some extent to Ramírez Pagán as well.[8]

The direct and indirect imitations of our Ariostean poem which have been quoted are, of course, not sporadic cases. They are merely examples of the European vogue of "Chiuso era il sol," and should be

[8] This sonnet is given as an imitation of Caro in "Las imitaciones italianas de Lomas Cantoral," *Revista de filología española*, XVII (1930), 166.

listed along with the versions of Bandello, G. F. Binni, Degli Oddi, A. Lionardi, Marino, Querenghi, Rota, T. Tasso, Du Bellay, Ronsard, Scève, Augustín Calderón, Lope de Vega, Martín de la Plaza, P. de Andrade Caminha, Faria y Sousa, Capel Loft[9]—proving that the sonnet was one of the most widely copied poems of the Italian Renaissance.

Turning briefly now to a re-examination of Ariosto's composition, we find that he seems to owe his procedure to Petrarch's sonnet "Gia fiammeggiava l'amorosa stella," in which the two quatrains, "Già fiammeggiava . . ." and "Levata era a filar . . ." provide the background for the unfolding of the action of the sestet: "Quando mia speme . . ." But this is not all—he clearly borrows his theme from the myth of Hero and Leander. It will be recalled that, every night, guided by a lamp which was kept lighted by Hero, Leander swam across the Hellespont to visit her; but one stormy night he was drowned. The points of contact are the storm, the *fiume altier*=Hellespont, *il lume dei bei vostri occhi*=the lamp of Hero, and the mention of the name of Leander.[10] Originality resides primarily in the final tercet with its striking ending and the strong contrast that it creates. This is the secret of its attraction and explains why it left behind it a long trail of imitations.

Northwestern University

[9] For further details see "Four Notes on Italian Influences," *Romanic Review*, XXVI (1935), 326-327.

[10] On the myth of Hero and Leander during the Renaissance consult F. Flamini, "La Historia de Leandro y Hero e l'ottava rima di Giovanni Boscán," in *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera* (Livorno, 1895), pp. 383-422. Also Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, pp. 334-378.

BOOK REVIEWS

WALT WHITMAN: CHOIX DES TEXTES. Traduction par Hélène Bokanowski. Paris: GLM [Guy Lévis Mano], 1947. 69 p.

WALT WHITMAN: UNE ÉTUDE, UN CHOIX DE POÈMES. Par Paul Jamati. Des dessins et des portraits. Paris: Pierre Seghers, 1948. 238p.

WALT WHITMAN. Von Hans Reisiger. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1946. 104p.

WALT WHITMAN: GRASHALME. Diese Auswahl wurde von Georg Goyert ins Deutsche übertragen. Berlin: Lothar Blanvalet Verlag, 1948. 112p.

WALT WHITMAN, EIN AMERIKANER. Bei Henry Canby. Uebersetzt von Georg Goyert. Berlin: Lothar Blanvalet Verlag, 1948. 456p.

WALT WHITMAN: SANGEN OM MEG SELV, AV "LEAVES OF GRASS." Oversettelse og Innledning ved Per Arneberg, Tegninger av Kai Fjell. Oslo: Forlagt av H. Aschehoug & Co., 1947. 123p.

"TIL WHITMAN GJENNEM WERGELAND." By Kjell Krogvig. *Samtiden*, LVII (1948), 196-202.

"WHITMAN Y EL ANTI-MODERNISMO." By John E. Englekirk. *Revista Iberoamericana*, XIII (Oct. 1947), 39-52.

LA ÚLTIMA VEZ QUE FLORECIERON LAS LILAS EN EL PATIO, DE WALT WHITMAN. Traducción de Arturo Torres-Rioseco. Mexico City: Colección Literaria de la Revista Iberoamericana, 1946. Serie A, Núm. 8. [13p.]

Walt Whitman might be said to have become a world poet before he was recognized in his own country as a major author. Indeed, the praise and analysis of his work by critics and scholars in England, Germany, France, and Denmark contributed greatly to the eventual growth of his reputation in the United States. During the past two years Whitman publications in America have notably declined, but abroad translations of his works have returned to something like the prewar level.

Hélène Bokanowski's small book of selected translations, published in a limited edition of 600 copies, is perhaps a symptom of a new trend in Whitman criticism, not limited to France. She begins her short introduction by referring to "Feuilles d'herbe" as "ce monument puissant et totémique." (Even American critics write more and more frequently of the "symbolical Whitman.") She has translated only some short poems and piquant extracts from "Song of Myself," "Song of the Open Road," "Song of the Rolling Earth," the Lincoln poems, and a few others, with the English text facing the French. She is interested, not in Whitman's rôle as prophet and leader of a new humanity, but in his lyrical expression and his historical importance: "Bien davantage qu'un apôtre de la démocratie, il faut considérer Walt Whitman comme un visionnaire. Sa réceptivité exceptionnelle exprime fortement la vision métaphysique de son époque, le développement gigantesque et brutal de son pays, de cette terre neuve en gestation, les complexités d'un tempérament sensuel et hybride."

Leaves of Grass has never been satisfactorily translated into French. Léon Bazalgette's complete version of the book (editions of 1909, 1914, and 1922) was, in the opinion of André Gide and other competent judges, too facile and "prettified." In protest against Bazalgette's first two editions, Gide, Jules Laforgue, and Louis Fabulet published some translations of their own in *Œuvres choises, poèmes et*

proses (1918), and this is probably still the most satisfactory book of Whitman selections in French.

Anyone who reads even one foreign language knows that the connotations of most poems are almost untranslatable, and Whitman's baroque diction, with its "mélange" of colloquialisms, hybrids, and esoteric symbolism, is enough to balk the most skilled translator. And Hélène Bokanowski is at times far from skilled. She renders

"Mine is no callous shell,"

as

"Point n'est creuse ma coquille . . . "

Bazalgette's plodding

"Mon enveloppe n'est pas une dure coquille,"

is at least more accurate. In "Song of the Open Road" she misses the allusion to "charging" an electrical battery when the poet declares of the "efflux of the soul,"

"Now it flows unto us, we are rightly charged."

"A présent qu'il nous inonde, nous sommes en bonnes mains."

In the more difficult lines in section 28 of "Song of Myself" she perhaps might be pardoned for failing to get all the implications in the poet's betrayal by his "fellow-senses":

"Treacherous tip of me reaching and crowding to help them . . .
They bribed to swap off with touch and go and graze at the edges of me . . ."

"Je suis trahi par ce qu'il y a de plus extrême en moi qui progresse et se rassemble afin de leur venir en aide . . .
Ils ont usé de corruption afin de me posséder par ce contact et puis effleurent tout ce qui touche à mes limites . . . "

In "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" she fails to convey the symbolism of "heart-shaped leaves" in "feuilles lancéolées" (Bazalgette has "dessinées comme un cœur"), but aptly uses "ramille" for "sprig" instead of Bazalgette's more general "branchette." Possibly these examples indicate not only some of the limitations of this translation but also Walt Whitman's lack of affinity for the French language, despite his fondness for French words.

Paul Jamati's book, with its long *étude* and generous sampling of the major sections of *Leaves of Grass*, amounts practically to a new French biography and anthology of Whitman's poems. The selections range all the way from the opening "One's-Self I Sing" of *Leaves of Grass* to the closing "So Long"[1] (which loses its colloquial flavor in "Adieu"). The anthology is composed of new translations by Marcelle Sibon and Paul Jamati, and a reprinting of some of Léon Bazalgette's, especially eight sections of his "Chant de moi-même." Both the virtues and shortcomings of Bazalgette's famous *Feuilles d'herbe* are apparent throughout the book, including, uncorrected, even some of the faulty translations.[2]

Bazalgette is unmistakably M. Jamati's master, for his influence permeates the whole book, and not least in the critical part. Rejecting all the discoveries and psy-

[1] From 1860 on this poem closed *Leaves of Grass*, exclusive of the later "annexes."

[2] Roger Asselineau, reviewing Jamati's book in *Les Langues Modernes*, XLII (1948), 447, remarks: "Certes, la traduction de Bazalgette a ses mérites. . . . Mais elle contient des gaucheries tout à fait inutiles et même des contre-sens caractérisés qu'il aurait été facile de corriger discrètement." He then cites some of the errors of Jamati and Sibon.

chological insights of Catel, and apparently unaware of the researches of Mrs. Molinoff on Whitman's family background, Jamati returns to a glorification of Bazalgette's saintly poet prophet. He is acquainted with Catel's point of view, but exclaims "O psychanalyse, que de ravages!" Consequently, he sees in the "Calamus" poems nothing but the social themes that the poet attached to them after he had gained control of the emotions that gestated them.

However, Jamati's essay is not simply a rehash of Bazalgette's two studies of Whitman. Something new has been added, something that may be portentous. Admitting that Whitman and his disciples built up a legend, he looks upon all discussions of the poet's sex pathology as a deliberate "contre-légende" perpetrated by antidemocratic critics. Afraid to attack democracy directly, they attack the most famous poet of democracy.

"Il est plus simple et plus efficace de discréditer l'adversaire en le convaincant d'imposture. Or l'adversaire, c'est Whitman. Et c'est ainsi que se développe, en face d'une légende, qu'il faut en effet détruire, une contre-légende, aussi mensongère, donc aussi nocive, qu'il faudra détruire à son tour."

Jamati's charges are not entirely hysterical; undoubtedly both Fascist and Communist critics have made biased contributions to the "contre-légende" (though in the United States the Communists have been trying to adopt Walt); but new evidence is inevitably bringing about a re-evaluation of both Whitman and his poetry. Some of these re-evaluations, such as those of Malcolm Cowley in this country, are—at least temporarily—endangering the fame of Walt Whitman; but a permanent reputation must be based on truth and not mere idealism. Even Cowley regards Whitman as a world poet. If his message continues to have meaning for the modern world, it will survive the "higher criticism." Only time can tell; but meanwhile Jamati's confidence is reassuring: "Walt Whitman, génie américain et génie universel, le plus grand du XIX^{e} siècle, Walt Whitman, poète de l'avenir, est un poète d'aujourd'hui."

Since other French translations of Whitman are said to be out of print, Jamati's book should prove useful. Unfortunately the biographical and critical essay contains a considerable number of petty errors. For example, Whitman did not lose every editorial position because "il refuse toute concession dans l'expression de ses opinions"; so far as we know, this happened once. He was not "un dandy . . . au Capitole"; that was while he was a journalist in Brooklyn. He was not editor of the New Orleans *Crescent*, only a reporter. He did not call himself "Walt" for the first time in the 1856 *Leaves* but in the first edition. And I do not agree with Jamati's description of the appearance of the 1855 *Leaves*, or with his emphasis on its failure. More important, Carlyle did not help introduce Whitman into England nor did Dante G. Rossetti assist very much; actually both disliked Whitman rather strongly. And, despite his role as the poet of athletes, Whitman did not while in Washington, or at any other time, frequent "assidûment le gymnase"! M. Jamati has not been able to distinguish between fact and vicarious symbolism. Following his master, Bazalgette, he is uncritical in interpreting Whitman's own statements.

This new French admiration reminds one of Germany in the pre-Nazi days. There in three separate periods Whitman became a cult, and after World War I he was one of the most discussed authors in Germany and Austria. Hans Reisiger's complete version of *Leaves of Grass* and selected prose became a classic in German literature soon after its appearance in 1922. Reisiger prefaced his work with an eloquent introduction (reprinted in pamphlet form in 1946) that deeply impressed Thomas Mann. Reisiger admired Whitman as a democratic symbol, which Mann identified with the humanity of Goethe and Novalis.

The appearance in 1948 of a handsome book of German translations—and from the hand of Georg Goyert, the distinguished translator of James Joyce, who has also turned Henry Seidel Canby's biography into German—is a significant event. Georg Goyert's translation is prefaced by no eloquent introduction, although it does contain a brief (and accurate) factual biographical note, which mentions the strength of the poet's voice for democracy and freedom. The poems translated, however, are those of more psychological and literary than social or political interest, beginning with "There Was a Child Went Forth," ranging through selections from "Children of Adam" and "Calamus," the great poems such as "Out of the Cradle . . . ," "When Lilacs Last . . . ," "Prayer for Columbus," and on to the old-age poems, "Darest Thou Now O Soul" and "After the Supper and Talk." It is a splendid collection, impressively translated, and it has been well received by German reviewers.

Goyert's translation of Mr. Canby's biography has apparently also been widely approved by German critics; but in the reviews which I have been able to examine I find no such idealistic acclaim for Whitman as Reisiger's work produced in the decade before Hitler's rise to power. The shorter reviews are mainly factual and noncommittal. A critic in the *Tägliche Rundschau* (June 1, 1947) refers to the "flutenden Gesänge der Demokratie, der auch in Europa auf Dichter wie Verhaeren, Richard Dehmel, Gerrit Engelke und Wladimir Majakowskij ansporend und wegweisend wirkte." A long review by Herbert Pfeiffer in *Der Tages Spiegel* (April 21, 1948), entitled "Die Umkehr in der Biographie," sees in this biographer more of an advocate than a critic. ("Es ist mehr Hingabe in ihm als Abstand"). Pfeffer thinks it is the custom in America for a biographer to make a hero of his subject, and says that perhaps Mr. Canby's American audience influenced his lack of objectivity and complete frankness. But he seems to envy a country that can still regard the individual as capable of being a hero in biography or fiction, and he commends this situation as healthier than the determinism of Taine, Emil Ludwig, and André Maurois, which made the individual the product of his environment.

"Die erste massive Biographie, die von Amerika nach dem Kriege zu uns kommt, zeigt, dass die Auslegung der Persönlichkeit aus sich selbst drüben bereits wieder stärker als bei uns über die rein soziologische oder geistesgeschichtliche Beleuchtung hinausgewachsen ist. Liegt es im Empfinden der Zeit, das Leben wieder mehr oder sogar ganz als individueller Held zu ertragen? Es scheint ein Widerspruch, denn die Politik ist immer kollektivistischer geworden. Aber vielleicht beginnt gerade hier die geistige Korrektur, die das seit Jahrzehnten von der Politik verkannte Individuum aus seiner Rolle als Massenfaktor löst. Die Herrschaft der Milieutheorie hat jedenfalls, das bestreitet heute niemand mehr, die Idee der persönlichen Willensfreiheit, der persönlichen Initiative, des Individuums als Welt für sich nicht zum besten unserer Entwicklung, nicht zu unserem Glück verdrängt."

Although Rudolf Schmidt translated *Democratic Vistas* into Danish in 1874, *Leaves of Grass* did not attract Scandinavian translators until the twentieth century, and not until recently have there been translations in the three countries, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Frederik Schyberg, now a famous literary critic in Copenhagen, is largely responsible for the present Scandinavian interest in Whitman. His selected *Walt Whitman Digte* (1933) and his biographical study, *Walt Whitman* (1933), both completed while he was still a university student, have attracted attention in Sweden and Norway. K. A. Svensson confessed his

indebtedness to Schyberg in the introduction to his *Strån av Gräss* (Stockholm, 1935); and Per Arneberg in his recent Norwegian edition of *Sangen om Meg Selv* (Oslo, 1947) acknowledges and plainly reveals the influence of Schyberg in his critical introduction.

Arneberg's book is the most eye-appealing translation of Whitman I have ever seen, beautifully printed on fine paper, as most Scandinavian books are, and illustrated with highly symbolical drawings by Kai Kjell. I find the drawings more Norse than Whitmanesque in spirit, but perhaps this is a favorable sign that the American poet is being acclimatized.

Especially to be commended is the translation of the entire "Song of Myself" instead of fragmentary selections, a common practice, for this one poem contains much of the substance of the entire *Leaves*. Moreover, Whitman's style cannot be adequately indicated by little snippets, like those in the Bokanowski collection. Arnesberg's translation appears to be remarkably close to the original in meaning and style. I do not know whether the excellence is due to his having profited from the examples of Schyberg and Svensson, to the greater adaptability of the Norwegian for Whitman's language, or simply to the translator's genius; but this is certainly close to the original:

"Jeg lovpriser meg selv og synger meg selv,
Og hva jeg dristig gjør skal også du gjøre,
For hvert atom i meg tilhører likegodt deg."

(First strophe, Sec. 1)

The initial reiterations (or "psychic rime") and parallelism are carefully preserved:

"Smil, å vellystige, kjøligåndende jord!
Jord av de slumrende saftfulle trær!
Jord av den sluknede aftenrøde—jord av de tåkeomhyllede tinder!
Jord av fullmånens glassklare flom med det blå skjær!
Jord av marmorerende lys og mørke over flodenes tidevann!
Jord av skyers gjennomsiktige grå, lysere og klarere for min skyld!
Fjerntfavnende, svingende jord—rikt epleblomstrende jord!
Smil, ti din elsker kommer."

(Seventh strophe, Sec. 21)

And so also the elliptical sentence:

"Et rop midt i mengden,
Min egen stemme, fulltonende, omslyngende, avgjørende."

"A call in the midst of the crowd,
My own voice, orutund sweeping and final."

(First strophe, Sec. 42)

The similarity of modern Norwegian to English enables Arneberg to come very near to catching Whitman's "organic" rhythms:

"Jeg farer bort som luft, jeg ryster mine hvite lokker mot den flyktende sol,
Jeg gyter mitt kjøtt ut i hvirvlene, og lar det drive som trasete flak."

"I depart as air, I shake my white locks at the runaway sun,
I effuse my flesh in eddies, and drift it in lacy jags."

(Fourth strophe, Sec. 52)

Arneberg's translation moved Kjell Krogvig to write an article for *Samtiden*, "Til Whitman Gjennem Wergeland," pointing out the similarity between Whitman and Henrik Wergeland, the author of the great Norwegian epic, *Skabelsen, Mennesket, og Messias* ("Creation, Mankind, and Messiah") as an aid for Norwegians in understanding the American poet—or more specifically, Arneberg's translation. Others, particularly Schyberg, have noted the remarkable parallels in thought and even style between these two great poets who did not know each other. Since the Norwegians themselves are beginning to publish comparative studies, it seems likely that Walt Whitman still has a future in Norway.

He probably also has a future in South America, but I am not well acquainted with the details of translation and critique to date. Professor Arturo Torres-Rioseco, of the University of California, has published in Mexico a translation of the lilac poem, "La última vez que florecieron las lilas en el patio." Professor John E. Englekirk, of Tulane, has pointed out in "Whitman y el Anti-modernismo" that most of the leaders in the antimodernist movement have either been influenced by Whitman or have held many of the same ideas. Canby's *Walt Whitman un americano* was published in Buenos Aires in 1946, and is said to have had a good reception. Fernando Alegría, of the Department of Spanish at the University of California, expects soon to complete a book on Whitman's reception and influence in Latin America.

American Whitmanians may be interested in knowing that Whitman is also being translated into Japanese. His work was introduced to Japanese readers as early as 1892, and since then six translations of selections from *Leaves of Grass* have been published, the best known being that of Shigetaka Naganuma. Mitsuru Ishii, president of the Japan Publishers' Association, wrote me in 1947: "There has been no complete translation. Mr. S. Naganuma is working on it now, and we hope the translation will come out in a year or two. 'The Specimen Days' has been translated by Takamura, as you note in your book [*Walt Whitman Handbook*]." Mr. Ishii also reported that, "About a month ago I came across David McKay's 1882 edition of *Specimen Days and Collect* in one of the book-shops in front of the Tokyo Imperial University." Evidently Walt Whitman survived the war in Japan; and it will be interesting to see whether Naganuma's translation rivals the popularity of Reisiger's in Germany after World War I.

GAY WILSON ALLEN

New York University

THEORY OF LITERATURE. By René Wellek and Austin Warren. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949. x, 403 p.

Radical in its viewpoint, rich in ideas and bibliographical material, poised in its judgment of other approaches to literature, this new "ergocentric" (p. 66) literary theory has in mind one object: the literary work of art. All literary activities of a practical order, such as the preliminary work for a critical edition or the paraphernalia of elucidation of background, biography, epoch, and psychology, have only auxiliary value. Proud "scholarly" approaches by way of history of ideas, psychoanalysis, sociology, despite occasionally good results when they treat the work itself, generally misunderstand their object, *la chose littéraire*, as Bernard Grasset would say, and degenerate into trivialities. The only thing that matters is the poem or the fictional prose work as the literary object *par excellence*, and criticism will deal exclusively with the forms included in *belles lettres*. True criticism of this literary object requires the inseparable union of poetics and literary

history. This literary history must be conscious of the fact that no work is isolated but exists in the evolution of its kind, belonging to the domain of history and not of science, as Rickert and Windelband have established.

To serve this triad of purposes, the literary student must have a profound understanding of the elements of literary art, such as rhythm and meter, style, image, metaphor, symbol, myth, literary genera; in other words, all the elements composing the structure of the literary work of art to be aesthetically evaluated. If this is true—and no reasonable scholar can doubt it—the whole training of the literary student in the graduate school will have to be changed. His critical qualities must be developed and a new method must replace his historical, philological, and linguistic drill.

This is the quintessence of Wellek-Warren's twentieth-century poetics, enthroned again after an era of positivistic relativism and art-blind behaviorism. Although English literature is the central matter for the different demonstrations, interesting parallels from German and Slavic literature and scholarship (fewer from the Romance field) are discussed. Thus the book represents literary theory on a comparative basis.

What might have been added further can readily be seen from the new book by Wolfgang Kayser, *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk, eine Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft* (Bern, 1948). After so much discussion of literary art, some concrete interpretations of texts would have been very welcome, even if reprinted from Professor Warren's *Rage for Order*. Kayser, it is true, has too many interpretations and lacks the wealth of theoretical disquisitions which Wellek-Warren provide. But, although Kayser is less rich theoretically, he better integrates the philological and particularly the mediaeval part of literary scholarship into the aesthetic task itself. In this method he has a forerunner in Paul V. Rubow, *Den kritiske Kunst* (Copenhagen, 1938). Wellek and Warren on their part make perhaps too sharp a division between the Middle Ages and modern times. This is not very helpful in view of *Beowulf*, Chaucer, Dante, and Chrétien de Troyes. Thus the important discussions concerning literary aesthetics of the Middle Ages which filled the 1930s (Glunz, Curtius, De Bruyne) are not considered.

Some few diverging ideas and suggested additions are here noted in view of a probable second edition; but these matters by no means touch the fundamental concept of Wellek and Warren, which stands firm and is warmly shared by the present reviewer. Among the theorists of literature who really have the same aims in the elucidation of the artifact, it is surprising to note the absence of mention of Jacques Maritain and Charles Du Bos. They explain most satisfactorily the question of the manner of existence of a poem (p. 154 ff.). Their names should have replaced, e.g., Gilby (p. 22) and the "Chicago New-Aristotelianism" (p. 33) as having also clarified the problem of truth and reality in poetry. Furthermore they tried to overcome the "anarchy of values" (pp. 35, 260). Henri Bremond, mentioned only once, should also have been explored for his "Poésie pure," "Prière et poésie," "Les deux musiques de la langue française," "Pour le romantisme," etc. The ideas of Huizinga have clarified all the implications of Flamboyant-Burgundian literature and the potentialities of the Renaissance, and have brought into focus the need to study literary periods at their very center because the constellation of stylistic features is more sharp and clear at that point. These considerations would have led to a more accurate and sympathetic view of the "Gothic" man and the "baroque" man (p. 33).

The interrelation between written literature and folklore as evidenced from the make-up of the Old French literary fables is a point well seen (p. 38). The evolution of folk poetry and its metamorphosis into literary poetry—particularly

of the ballad—has commanded the attention of leading scholars such as Entwistle and Ramón Menéndez Pidal who are important for having established terms like "popular," "traditional," and "erudite." These names might have been mentioned (p. 39). Hans Naumann does not treat all oral literature as "gesunkenes Kulturgut" (p. 39), but in part also as "primitive Gemeinschaftskultur."

Among the best attempts at dealing with the Romance literatures as a whole is that of Heinrich Morf, which deserves mention. Among those who considered literary history as history of national ideas is Victor Klemperer (p. 42). In view of the fact that Anglo-Norman is declared an integral part of England's literature (p. 43), Urban T. Holmes' mediaeval French bibliography would deserve listing (p. 51). As for the criteria for dating mediaeval manuscripts, the miniatures and the neumes should have been taken into consideration. To give the student an idea of all the palaeographical "Hilfswissenschaften," no better instrument could have been indicated than the new magazine *Scriptorium* (pp. 51-61).

The psychological classification of poets as "makers" and "possessed" (p. 79) could be supplemented by Franz Dornseiff's more stylistic typology of *Anspieler* and *Ausdrucksverstärker*, or Vossler's categories "sensibel" and "motorisch."

The best book to illustrate the status of a typical literary, cultured audience and public (p. 95) is the brochure on the French public of the seventeenth century by Erich Auerbach. As Ludwig Klages is the most prototypical among those "suspicious of the intellect" (p. 104), so among the idolaters of the intellect is Julien Benda, whose ideas on modern "Byzantinism" would have bridled the enthusiasm for Valéry and T. S. Eliot. Pp. 108-114 should clearly distinguish between history of ideas, of problems, of motives, and of religious attitudes.

In the jumble of German romanticism (p. 119) a certain order was attempted by Josef Nadler, who distinguished between "romanticism" and "restoration." Professor Wellek, fighting the "time spirit," fights against windmills, since Dagobert Frey (whose thesis is buttressed by his American interpreter Professor Hassold) has made clear that this time spirit is an endemic psychology which can be explained satisfactorily by cultural surroundings and changes (p. 120). Dagobert Frey ought to have been mentioned also as one of the few scholars who strove, like Wellek and Warren, for a periodization independent of extraliterary causes.

If, in the discussion of euphony (pp. 159 ff.) the term "musicality" were replaced by "melodiousness," the vocalic harmony of a poem could be sharply opposed to its rhythmic structure (p. 126). It is a pity that Wellek and Warren entirely ignore the work of Theophil Spoerri, particularly his *Französische Metrik* with its excellent analyses and remarks on verse and prose rhythm. Spoerri's inquiry into the origin of Dante's verse belongs among the decisive studies. Pp. 140 ff. concerning "inner form," "matter," "form" should be rewritten with sharper distinctions such as those offered by Wilhelm von Humboldt, Kayser, and the article "Form" in Shipley's dictionary. In the important chapter on "Fuhpony, Rhythm, and Meter," the problem of why and how the hovering accentuation accompanying a fixed scheme of stressed and unstressed syllables tends to express feelings, attitudes, and movements is not treated. Madame Amrein-Widmer's important study, *Rhythmus als Ausdruck inneren Erlebens in Dantes Divina Commedia* (1932) contains a wealth of convincing information about this problem. The intrusion of the Latin *numerus* into the vernacular can be best approached through A. Schiaffini's investigations.

In the chapter on "Style and Stylistics" (p. 179), the linguistic "field" or "area" as discovered by Jost Trier should be explained. The whole section on style is somewhat short as compared to the parallel chapter in Kayser. The opinion of the present reviewer regarding stylistics may be read in the Spring-Summer 1949

number of the *Yale French Studies*, where he shows himself less skeptical and "cautious" towards Spitzer and the Vossler school; but on the main points he is in agreement with Wellek and Warren.

On the subject of the symbol (p. 193) the best material is still offered by Baudelaire and Flaubert (*rapport fatal*), recently very well exploited by Luc Estang in his *Introduction à la poésie*. The Thomist concept of *aeviternum*, the presence of the eternal in the temporal, is also helpful for the symbol. The somewhat belittled Professor Herbert Cysarz could, nevertheless, have been mentioned (p. 203) for his idea of the baroque prism which breaks the divine unity of thought into the innumerable images of man. Carl Jung, along with Emile Caillet, should have been referred to in the archetype discussion on p. 213. That would also have been the place to recognize that psychoanalysis can contribute directly to the solution of aesthetic problems, as in the case of Baudouin's study on Verhaeren and Pfandl's on Sor Juana Inez de la Cruz, in contradistinction to the studies of Reik, Vodoz, and others.

Cervantes, the creator of truly modern narrative fiction as well as of the slogan, "the novel is the modern epic," is given little consideration. Boccaccio, too, the creator of the modern short story and the ideal architect of it (*The Falcon*), is treated as a stepchild in the chapter on "The Nature and Modes of Narrative Fiction." In discussing the novelistic motifs (p. 225) distinctions between the thematic motif and the stylistic leitmotif would have been helpful. The problem of the habitat (p. 229) has found a critical consideration in Hia Landau's study of the Belgian naturalist, Lemonnier. In the comedy, the characterization by stock phrases occurs on a high-comedy level in Molière. The important *style indirect libre* (p. 233) needs much broader treatment, and the decisive studies by E. Lerch, E. Lorck, and M. Lips should be listed in the bibliography.

The correspondences between grammatical structures and literary kinds (p. 237) have been elaborated not only by R. Jakobson but also by K. Vossler ("Die Nationalsprachen als Stile"). The problem whether classical art is objectively superior to any other type is more serious than admitted (p. 245). It represents the idea of something absolute against the thesis of the relativity of all styles. The concept of "world becoming language" (p. 252) according to Lucka's theory has independently become one of the finest arguments for Auerbach's thesis that modern realism is the most ideal form of mimesis. Literary relationships (pp. 270 ff.) receive their greatest support in the transfer of motifs and *topoi* from antiquity, the new problem of E. R. Curtius, whereas originality is always preserved by the spirit infused into them. The problem of generation (p. 279) has been treated with acumen and originality by Pinder and Jeschke. Pinder, mentioned only in note 33, p. 345, applied it to the rhythmical change from the ascendancy at one time of forms to the dominance of ideas at another; Jeschke applied it to the Spanish generation of 1898 in an attempt to define a generation style.

There are in this book, of course, pages and pages which one would like to quote as being absolutely to the point. Professor Wellek, condemning the German *Geistesgeschichte* as pretentious and preposterous, has, today at least, the sanction of "uno di color che sanno": Karl Viëtor.

While acknowledging that something must be done about the scholarly education of the literary student, the present reviewer does not share Wellek-Warren's revolutionary attitude to the point of abandoning philological-historical training. The recipe of Wellek-Warren leads inevitably into the feared history of ideas. For style and art a thorough knowledge of the language, its growth and structure (as Jesperson and von Wartburg would put it), is the *conditio sine qua non*. An additional training in general aesthetics and history of art will give this "old-fashioned"

philology the right turn. Thus, in the practical field, a somewhat more conservative treatment would be desirable. As it stands, however, the book is a landmark in literary studies.

H. H.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FRENCH TRANSLATIONS OF ENGLISH WORKS: 1700-1800. By Charles Alfred Rochedieu. With an Introduction by Donald F. Bond. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1948. xiii, 387 p.

"France," said Burke, "has always more or less influenced manners in England." If so, England repaid the obligation with a century and a half of influence on ideas in France. From this interchange of civilities England emerged with its insularity much diluted, and France with a loosened hold on its self-sufficiency. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Frenchmen held that "everything that was not French ate hay and walked on four legs." But at its close Prince C. J. de Ligne declared that "Society and all countries each day resemble one another more."

The common interests in the world of ideas which united the literate classes of both countries owed much to travelers, among whom the most notable was Voltaire, who more than any one man focussed the attention of France on the literary celebrities, habits of thought, and ways of life that distinguished the England of his day. The publication of the *Encyclopédie* in the 1750s, which gathered up a general survey of the output of the press across the Channel, was alarming enough in its disclosures to call for its suppression. And the influx of Frenchmen to Englang, both as visitors and as refugees during the last two decades of the century, deepened Anglophilism almost to a mania.

But the main impetus that moved France to more widespread efforts to break through the repressive powers of the State, the Church, and the Sorbonne came from the innovating spirit of translations, which touched upon and added to every phase of mental quickening agitating France of the Revolution—philosophy, science, religion, politics, social ideas, and literature. That the two peoples exchanged freely by this means the productions of their presses has been a commonplace of knowledge with students of the period. But not until the appearance of Professor Rochedieu's volume has it been possible to estimate exactly the far-ranging curiosity of the French mind in search of nourishment after its long spell of censored diet.

For the first time, we have in one volume a complete survey of French translations from the English made between 1700 and 1800. The number of items listed is impressive, though doubtless it will be augmented as time goes on, for no bibliographer can say with certitude, "You need look no further." The book is admirably designed to serve the convenience of the student. The English authors with their titles are placed in alphabetical order, with translations, various editions, and imitations following in chronological arrangement. The French titles abbreviated, which by themselves would often provide little clue to their identity, are included in the alphabetical scheme, with cross references to the English authors. Translations of anonymous works are given in Appendix I; those of unidentified authors, in Appendix II; and those of collections referable to no known editor, in Appendix III. The plan of the index is unique in that the names of the English authors are listed under the classifications of Arts, History, Literature (subdivided into its branches), Sciences (likewise subdivided), Philosophy and Religion, Travel, and Books Relating to the United States. A mere glance at the index will reveal that the field which attracted most translation was that of the

sciences, with literature a close second, travels and histories third, philosophy and religion fourth, works on the United States fifth, and the arts with a poor showing last. Curiously the interest in medicine exceeds that in mathematics, and in literature the novel far outruns its fellow departments.

Casual reading of almost any page suggests an indiscriminate appetite for nearly any work written in English. Yet some indication of the popularity of any given author and the prevailing bent of the French mind may be found by a count of the pages taken up with an author and his works. Pope leads with six pages; Shakespeare comes next with five; Milton with three and a half, of which two are occupied with *Paradise Lost*; Hume with three; Locke, Addison, Defoe, Fielding, Burke with nearly three; Steele with two and a half; Richardson, Paine, and Franklin two; Dodsley, Captain Cook, and Priestly nearly two; Goldsmith one and a half.

It is a matter of wonder why certain works were translated at all and, equally, why certain stellar figures were overlooked, especially since many of the latter could contribute directly to some of the dominating tastes and fashions of thought in France. First of all, one misses Bishop Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, which was, so it has been said, popular in France. Overlooked also were such poets as John Dyer, Richard Owen Cambridge, Chatterton, and Burns. Godwin's *Political Justice* is strangely absent, and so are Horne Tooke's *Diversions of Purley* and Malthus' *Essay on Population*. Dodsley's *Fables*, Raspe's *Travels of Baron Munchausen*, Campbell's *Political Survey of Britain*, Stuart and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens*, Chandler's *Ionian Antiquities*, all of which had kindred affiliations in France, receive no mention. And the vast field of antiquarian research, which deeply engaged the learned in eighteenth-century England, is represented by only two minor works.

It is possible that some of the above items, along with others, may turn up in some *bibliothèque*; but one must believe that the editor's gleaning in the field was as meticulous as that of the famed Ruth. The joy of discovering errors and its reward in the exhibition of superior knowledge, which reviewers usually count on, is here all but denied one. The scanty pickings which I have lit on can be quickly displayed. The 1745 translation of Pope's *Essay on Man* (p. 253) was a prose rendering; presumably this was true of the 1736 version. Lockitt, in his *The Relations of French and English Society*, names V. de Gournay as the translator of Joshua Gee's *On the Causes of Commercial Decline* (p. 121) and also of Charles King's *The British Merchant* (p. 178), and Turgot as translator of Hume's *Jealousy of Trade* (p. 159). Captain Constantine Phipps is credited with making a voyage to the *South Pole*, which is precisely the opposite direction he sailed—the French title correctly prints *Pôle boréal* (p. 247). The name Christopher Nugent (p. 233) should be printed in large caps to be consistent with the scheme of typography. The editor and the Chicago University Press are to be congratulated on their care in proofreading.

The scholarly introduction by Professor Donald F. Bond ably sums up the generally known sources for information on the dissemination of ideas cast in the English mold which brought France and England together in an international tie known neither before nor since. One could add a modern work, i.e., Lois S. Gaudin's *Les Lettres anglaises dans l'Encyclopédie* (1942), which analyzes the contribution of this monumental work to the knowledge of English thought in France, a contribution that turns out to be much overrated.

EDWARD G. COX

University of Washington

PERETZ. Translated and edited by Sol Liptzin. (Vivo Bilingual Series.) New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1947. 381 p.

The plan upon which the present volume has been modeled is a sound one; I hope that the Yiddish Scientific Institute will publish similar volumes for those two other writers of the classic trio in Yiddish literature, Sholom Aleichem and Mendele Mocher Seforim. This is especially desirable in Mendele's case. There have, fortunately, been a number of recent translations and adaptations into English of the prose of Sholom Aleichem. When I speak of the plan of this volume I have in mind three things—the selections from Peretz's work made by Professor Liptzin (with the assistance of Samuel Charney and Max Weinreich), the kind of introduction which he has chosen to write (which, incidentally, specifically brings the volume into the province of comparative literature), and the manner in which he has presented his translations.

The selections of Peretz chosen for translation include only his prose, and the prose selected is limited to his stories and articles of political journalism. Peretz is not represented in his role as a poet or as a playwright, and the omission, I think, is just as well. Certainly, in an introductory volume of this kind, what we wish for is the strongest part, the marrow of his work, and that is to be found largely in the prose selections included. Peretz was both an artist and a journalist (like Dostoevski); in his first role, he excelled in the story or fable, while, in his second, he excelled in the occasional editorial article, which, by grasping the essentials of a contemporary dilemma, became of more than ephemeral interest. The poetry of Peretz, on the other hand, with all of the spasmodic power and interest which are bound to attend the productions of so felicitous a writer, is the less important part of his work—it is too full of echoes of Heine, the blighting fault of almost all the poetry of Peretz's age in Yiddish.

I have three reservations concerning the selection of material for this volume. First, some indication should have been provided of the principles used in making the selection, in order to indicate to the reader who needs such an introduction (and it is primarily to him that the volume is addressed) the range and nature of what was omitted. Second, there should have been some indication of the dates at which the journalistic articles were composed; and perhaps it would have been advisable, too, to indicate briefly the contextual circumstances of the composition of each selection. For example, that remarkable editorial called "Hope and Fear" foretold the course of the Russian Revolution down to our own day and perhaps beyond—how much more firmly rooted in historical reality it would seem if the date of its composition had been shown to coincide with the first Russian Revolution of 1905! My third criticism on the score of selections is that, granting the validity of the limitation to such prose narrative and journalism as the book contains, it is hard to see the reason for the omission of Peretz's single most famous story, *Bontche the Silent*. I know that the story can be found in whatever anthologies have included anything by Peretz (but how many are there, aside from Barrett and Clark's *Great Short Stories of the World* and Helena Frank's *Yiddish Tales*?), that it appears also in Leo Weiner's history of *Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century* and in Maurice Samuel's volume on Peretz; but this is no reason for having omitted from an introductory volume such a strong exhibition of Peretz's literary skill as a satirist and fabulist. But such cavils will go on as long as selections are made; and, to be just, we must note that the level of taste displayed here, considering what was at the disposal of the editor, is very high indeed.

The introduction by Professor Liptzin, in which he makes a detailed comparison of the theme of one of Peretz's major stories, *Self-Sacrifice*, with the Tannhauser

theme in German literature and the Alcestis theme in Greek literature, appears to me to be sensitive and original. His exposition convinces this reader, at any rate, that, whether consciously or not, Peretz constructed his story out of materials made available to him by world literature, with which he was surely better acquainted than other contemporary masters of Yiddish, whose general culture was often as limited as the ghettos from which they sprang. Liptzin shows us how the pagan and Christian themes are transmuted by the necessity of adapting them to Jewish values. He has undertaken a difficult task, and he has accomplished his aim in a way which carries conviction to my mind. In 1940, A. A. Roback estimated that there were about two hundred articles devoted to the work of Peretz in Yiddish. I am not acquainted with the entire body of this criticism; but, in what I have seen, I recall no approach similar to that of Liptzin. Peretz is usually compared to the Slavic writers who were part of his immediate intellectual environment; but too little effort has been made to fit his work into a world picture of literature, in which he obviously belongs.

As for the manner in which these translations are presented, it is that of the Loeb Classical Library with the original text and the English version facing each other on opposite pages. The device is so excellent that one wonders why, if the work is serious enough to merit the added expense, translations are ever presented otherwise. It is so convenient for purposes of checking and considering stylistic devices; it is helpful to those readers (and there are many thousands of children of Jewish immigrants in this category) who have a smattering of the Yiddish language at their disposal, a childhood memory of its sound and of its look on the printed page, and for whom such a book may not only be a literary experience but a kind of Rosetta Stone for the recovery of a lost or slipping language.

Professor Liptzin's translation is free without being loose. It is academically sound. It is not "interpretation" in the sense given to the word by Maurice Samuel (whose labors, from a more popular, less academic angle, are nevertheless so valuable). It is faithful but not hidebound, restrained but not stiff. That the translation is aimed at an audience with only a very elementary idea of things Yiddish is evident from the elaboration of the word *Kaddish* into "the traditional prayer for the dead." This phrase is actually included in the text as if it were part of Peretz's story, which it is not. I realize vividly (having myself translated a work by Sholem Asch from Yiddish) the problem that Liptzin faced here; but let us admit, even at the risk of unpopularity in certain circles, that there are some problems insoluble, in the strict sense, without footnotes.

Of course, I can never read any translation of a master of another language which I know, without wishing that it could have been composed as the King James version of the Bible was composed—by collaboration. Though it may be true that creation is best carried on by an individual without interference from anybody, translation is another matter. In translation, two heads are always better than one, and three better than two. In principle, I think there would be much to gain from the mutual tug, resistance, and pressure of a Maurice Samuel with his journalistic flair, on the one hand, and Professor Liptzin, with his academic conscience, on the other. The only effective argument against collaboration in translation that I have ever heard is an economic and not an intellectual one. It would cost too much. Agreed—so far as the ordinary author is concerned, but not the classic! Though exceptions may be cited, the general rule holds that great creative works are not produced by collaboration, and great translations are not produced apart from it.

Professor Liptzin has done nobly in his solitary role.

MILTON HINDUS

Brandeis University

JEPHTHAH AND HIS DAUGHTER, A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE. By W. O. Sypherd. Newark: University of Delaware, 1948. xiii, 277 p. Illustrated.

Professor Sypherd's study of the dissemination of a Biblical motif in literature and in the arts illustrates well why American scholars, for the most part, have not cared to pursue comparative subjects of this kind. The reason is obvious. No quick avenues lie open for a ready accumulation of materials. The track runs to the doorways of all main European libraries. Infinite patience is requisite to discover the depositories of individual items. The search alone requires years before a comprehensive review of the treatments of such a theme is possible. Furthermore, unless one is fortunate enough to be familiar with all European languages, interpretation will, perforce, depend upon the cooperation of several scholars in various linguistic areas, before final analysis can be presented to English readers. The evidence of a single effort in the coordination of the literary history of the variants of a theme lies at hand in Professor Sypherd's volume. The study presents an excellent method for dealing comparatively with a single motif. It is most exhaustive in respect to the dramatic, poetical, and musical treatments of the theme.

A "Historical and Critical Sketch" makes up the first part of the volume. A chronological survey considers in detail the more important literary uses of the Jephthah story, beginning with an unknown poet's effusion in the first century and continuing to the adaptations of the story in recent times. Highlighted are George Buchanan's excellent drama, which found many paraphrases in various European countries; the appearance of the story in the religious drama of the seventeenth century, an area not easy to survey; and the numerous texts for musical compositions, an area well worth the attention of musicologists.

The second part of the volume deals more specifically with the appearance of each item in the time scale, without regard to its quality as literature or as art. The appendices contain numerous annotations of the application of the story in the pictorial arts. Convenient indexes are provided for the survey of the authors of literary treatments, authors of texts of musical compositions, composers of music, Jesuit dramas and oratorios, Hebrew, Yiddish, and Ladino treatments, and the geographical distribution of literary and of musical creations. A general index concludes the study.

The surprising wealth of Jephthah material led Professor Sypherd to "venture to say" that no Biblical motif "has had so wide and so varied appeal." He has made a good case for this particular story, which, however, most scholars might have difficulty in calling to memory. A dozen other stories are better known: Cain, Abraham, Moses, Samson, Saul, David, Esther, Job, Ruth, Susanna, the Prodigal Son, and Herod. A survey of any of these motifs in a range equal to Professor Sypherd's would probably show a literary usage at least as extensive as that of the Jephthah story. As subjects for texts of music, not all would show as well, for the lament of the daughter is ready inspiration for choral settings.

Professor Sypherd's thorough search in German archives, the only check which I have applied to his materials, seems to have exhausted the extant literary treatments of the theme. Indeed, the present chaotic state of German libraries no longer permits the pursuit of a theme as comprehensive in scope as the area covered in this volume. One item may be added to Professor Sypherd's list, although its literary value is probably small: *Die Bücher Josuae und der Richter, Reimen und Gesangweisz* (Speyer, 1589), 12mo. (see Emil Weller, in *Annalen*, Freiburg im. B., 1864, vol. II, sec. 9, no. 264). On p. 43, read *Hartl* for *Hartt*. Hofman von Hofmanswaldau (pp. 71-73) is generally spelled with two *n*'s.

C. GRANT LOOMIS

University of California

THE "TRISTAN AND ISOLDE" OF GOTTFRIED VON STRASSBURG. Translated by Edwin H. Zeydel, with introduction, notes, and connecting summaries. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for University of Cincinnati, 1948. viii, 209 p.

Students of world literature who lack a knowledge of Middle High German will be grateful for this English translation, the first in verse, of this perhaps the most popular piece of mediaeval German literature. Of the 19,552 verses of the uncompleted original we have here almost 6,000 in a "line-for-line rendering, with rhythm, rhyme and style approximating those of the original, as far as can be reproduced in such a tongue as modern English." Despite these self-imposed limitations and the fact that English unlike the German is particularly limited in feminine rhymes, the translator has by and large been extremely successful in catching and reproducing both the form and the content of the poem, which in the original are so intimately combined. A comparison with the text of Gottfried at almost any place in the poem will at once demonstrate the unusual felicity of Dr. Zeydel's translation. One wonders at the sprightliness of the rhymes and the skillful use of *enjambement*, which is one of the striking characteristics of the original—and yet the translation is remarkably close.

With all the excellent skill and ingenuity of the translator, still he does at times lapse into impure rhymes, in contrast to the original, which is quite unique in respect to purity of rhyme. We might wink at such rhymes as the often-used "mood-good" and "maid-said," but we are startled at "found-wound," "thwart-heart," "place-praise," "roved-beloved," "come-home," etc. The worst offender is "shew," which is frequently rhymed with "due," "too," "do," "knew," "true," etc. According to the *New English Dictionary*, shew "represents the obsolete pronunciation (indicated by rhymes like view, true, down to c. 1700)." "Show" also appears several times in rhymes. Again, the Scotch dialect word "agley" does not rhyme with "way." The translator has intentionally introduced a few archaisms, e.g., "eke," "enow," etc., which however do not offend, since they are rarely used as rhyme words. Contractions sometimes seem overdone and odd, e.g., 'tin (it in), 'thad (it had), 'tbe (it be).

The rhymes have of necessity at times forced a slight change from the original meaning. However, there are a few gross errors which show a misunderstanding of the text. In line 662 *pfelle* does not mean "skins." In lines 7026-7029 Morolt is given credit for more than he really accomplished:

> Now Morolt charged in fierce array
> and cleanly through the cover cut
> the horse's front part from its butt,
> and Tristan leaped from off the horse.

Morolt did not cut the horse in two, but simply clipped the shoulder joint (*buoc*) of Tristan's horse and caused it to collapse. The oft-quoted (blasphemous?) words, lines 15737-48, are not at all well reproduced and could have been omitted.

The introduction gives a judicious survey of problems concerned with the Tristan legend as far as it is traceable in the literatures of other lands. The Bibliography takes into account especially the interests of students of comparative literature. One striking omission is the text edition by Karl Marold (Leipzig, 1912), with the variants from all known manuscripts. The translator should have used this standard edition as his basis rather than the popular one by Bechstein.

RICHARD JENTE

University of North Carolina

BOOKS RECEIVED

Anderson, George K. The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. xii, 431 p.

Benz, Ernest. Emanuel Swedenborg: Naturforscher und Seher. München: Verlag Hermann Rinn, 1948. 588 p.

Ciardo, Manlio. Un fallito tentativo di riforma dello Hegelismo: L'idealismo attuale. Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1948. viii, 216 p.

Dizionario letterario Bompiani delle Opere e dei Personaggi di tutti i tempi e di tutte le letterature. Vol. V, N-P. Milano: Valentino Bompiani Editore, 1948. xi, 890 p.

Flores, Angel, and M. J. Benardete (editors). Cervantes Across the Centuries. A Quadricentennial Volume. New York: Dryden Press, 1947. ix, 374 p.

Fubini, Mario. Studi sulla letteratura del Rinascimento. Firenze: Sansoni, 1947. vi, 321 p.

Harris, Victor. All Coherence Gone. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949. x, 255 p.

Huff, Sister Mary Cyria. The Sonnet "No Me Mueve, Mi Dios"—Its Theme in Spanish Tradition. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1948. viii, 142 p.

Le Breton, Maurice. Anthologie de la poésie américaine contemporaine. Paris: Denoël, 1948. 346 p.

Milch, Werner. Ströme—Formeln—Manifeste: Drei Vorträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Marburg/Lahn: Simons Verlag, 1949. 91 p.

Momigliano, Attilio (editor). Problemi ed orientamenti critici di lingua e di letteratura italiana. Vol. IV. Letterature Comparate, a cura di A. Viscardi, C. Pellegrini, A. Croce, M. Praz, V. Santoli, M. Sansone, T. Sorbelli. Milano: Carlo Marzorati, 1948. 382 p.

Nerval, Gérard de. Les Chimères. Exégèses de Jeanine Moulin. Lille: Giard; Genève: Droz, 1949. lxiii, 95 p.

Orrei, Ernesto. J. A. Fichte e i Discorsi alla nazione tedesca. Bari: Lateza & Figli, 1948. 181 p.

Pattison, Bruce. Music and Poetry of the English Renaissance. London: Methuen & Co., 1948. ix, 220 p.

Paulhan, Jean, and Dominique Aury (editors). La Patrie se fait tous les jours: Textes français 1939-1945. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1947. 500 p.

Polverini, Giorgio. Dignità dell'uomo ed altri saggi brevi. Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1948. 235 p.

Redman, Ben Ray (editor). The Portable Voltaire. New York: Viking Press, 1949. v, 569 p.

Rehm, Walther. Kierkegaard und der Verführer. München: Verlag Hermann Rinn, 1949. 620 p.

Richter, Werner. Die Zukunft der deutschen Universität. Marburg/Lahn: Simons Verlag, 1949. 42 p.

Roach, William (editor). The Continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes. Vol. I. The First Continuation: Redaction of Mss T V D. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949. lxii, 446 p.

Rossman, Fritz. Nikolaus Kopernikus: Erster Entwurf seines Weltsystems sowie eine Auseinandersetzung Johannes Keplers mit Aristoteles uber die Bewegung der Erde. Nach den Handschriften herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert. München: Verlag Hermann Rinn, 1948. 100 p.

Rousseau, J.-J. Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire. Edition critique par Marcel Raymond. Lille: Giard; Genève: Droz, 1948. lxii, 225 p.

Routh, James. The Theory of Verse. Being Several Journal Articles With Additional Chapters To Make A Complete Theory. Atlanta, Ga., 1948. 156 p. Lithoprinted.

Rudino, Carlo. Il dramma di Margherita: Interpretazione dal Goethe. Milano: Casa Editrice Ceschina, 1947. 95 p.

Rupé, Hans. Divertimenti: Reden und Aufsätze. München: Hermann Rinn, 1948. 116 p.

Sabatier, Pierre. Germinie Lacerteux des Goncourt. Paris: Sfelt, 1948. 187 p.

Strich, Fritz. Deutsche Klassik und Romantik, oder Vollendung und Unendlichkeit. Ein Vergleich. Bern: A. Francke AG. Verlag, 1949. 374 p.

Toffanin, Giuseppe. La fine del Logos. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1948. vii, 202 p.

Viglione, Francesco. L'Italia nel pensiero degli scrittori inglesi. Milano: Bocca, 1946. 545 p.

Wencelius, Léon. Trois pionniers de l'humanisme français au XVI^{e} siècle. Drei Bahnbrecher des französischen Humanismus im XVI. Jahrhundert. Mainz: Florian Kupferberg, 1948. 50 p.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Comparative Literature calls to the attention of its readers the new policy of *The Explicator*, which now welcomes contributions dealing with world literature. The advisory editor on foreign literatures is Professor Vernon Hall, Jr. of Dartmouth College.

The *Revista di letterature moderne*, published under the editorship of Professor C. Pellegrini of Florence, devotes most of its pages to comparative studies and deserves, along with the indispensable old standby, the *Revue de Littérature comparée*, the support of all comparatists and research libraries.

Goethe Number

The Fall 1949 issue of **Comparative Literature** will be a special Goethe number, in honor of the poet's bicentenary. It will contain the following articles:

Goethe und die Schweiz.
By Fritz Strich.

Literary Relations in the Light of Goethe's "Wiederspiegelung."
By L. A. Willoughby.

Goethe homme du milieu.
By Edmond Vermeil.

Croce as a Critic of Goethe.
By Lienhard Bergel.

George Ticknor's "Sorrows of Young Werter."
By Frank G. Ryder.